



1989

The Quest for Excellence: A Study of the Improvement of Student Achievement in Valley View Community Unit District 365u, 1960-1988

Patricia B. Smith
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Recommended Citation

Smith, Patricia B., "The Quest for Excellence: A Study of the Improvement of Student Achievement in Valley View Community Unit District 365u, 1960-1988" (1989). *Dissertations*. 2674.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2674

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 1989 Patricia B. Smith

THE QUEST FOR EXCELLENCE: A STUDY OF THE IMPROVEMENT
OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN VALLEY VIEW
COMMUNITY UNIT DISTRICT 365U
1960-1988

by
Patricia B. Smith

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
June
1989

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author appreciates the assistance given by the members of the doctoral committee: Dr. Max Bailey, Dr. Art Safer, and Dr. Joan Smith.

The author also wishes to acknowledge the assistance given to her by the following staff of Valley View Community Unit District 365U: Paul Swinford, John Lukancic, Annette Moore, John Eckman, Shirley Klaczynski, and Emmie Dunn. Most helpful in authenticating the accuracy of the information has been Dr. David Pankake, retired Assistant Superintendent of Instruction for Valley View Community Unit District 365U and Mr. Paul Swinford, Treasurer for Valley View. Appreciation is also given to the Villages of Bolingbrook and Romeoville for their cooperation in providing background information about the history and socio-economic composition of the villages and to Lockport Township High School #205 for its assistance with historical information.

Finally, special appreciation is extended to my husband, Charles; my mother, Faye Bresnahan; my mother-in-law, Arlene Smith; and special friend, Linda Kunesch, for the special support that they have provided throughout the pursuit of the degree.

VITA

The author, Patricia Bresnahan Smith, is the daughter of Melvin Bresnahan and Faye Bresnahan. She was born March 27, 1945, in Lafayette, Indiana. Her elementary and secondary education was completed in the Lafayette School Corporation in Lafayette, Indiana. She graduated from Jefferson High School in June 1963. In September 1963, she entered Purdue University and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Elementary Education in June 1967. While at Purdue, she was a member of the Purduettes, a singing group, and a member of Alpha Omicron Pi Sorority. A Master of Arts degree in Early Childhood Education was obtained in May 1976. She received her General Administrative Certificate through Northern Illinois University in 1978.

Additional training has been through Practical Management Associates, American Management Associates, and workshops by Larry Lezotte, David Berliner, Madeline Hunter, and Jerry Bellon.

Ms. Smith taught for three years in LaGrange, Illinois, one year in Naperville, and for eighteen years in Bolingbrook. During the eighteen years in Valley View

Community Unit District 365U, she has been a principal for ten years.

During her professional career she has been an active participant in curriculum development activities, given presentations at a high school career orientation day and a mathematics conference, supervised student teachers, worked with universities to coordinate clinical supervision experiences in classrooms, served as a demonstration center for the Early Prevention of School Failure Program, and currently is a member of the Early Childhood Cadre for the Tri-County Educational Service Center. She is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the American Association of School Administrators.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE	2
PROCEDURE AND SOURCES	4
LIMITATIONS	6
DEFINITIONS	8
EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS RESEARCH	9
MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES	25
 II. VALLEY VIEW DISTRICT PRIOR TO 1974	 38
DISTRICT 96	39
FINANCE	43
45/15 YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL YEAR	45
LEGAL	52
DISTRICT 205 AND THE FORMATION OF DISTRICT 211	 54
FORMATION OF VALLEY VIEW COMMUNITY UNIT DISTRICT 365U	 58
POLICY	60
CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION	64
OPEN SPACE	68
ENROLLMENT	70
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	72

III. VALLEY VIEW DISTRICT 1974-1979	82
BACKGROUND	83
MANAGEMENT REORGANIZATION	85
CURRICULUM	97
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	102
ENROLLMENT AND 45/15	114
POLICY	122
FINANCE	125
IV. VALLEY VIEW DISTRICT 1980-1988	134
ENROLLMENT AND HOUSING	135
FINANCE	138
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	153
RECOGNITION AND ACHIEVEMENT	166
POLICY	171
REFORM LEGISLATION	180
CURRICULUM	184
MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION	190
V. THE CHALLENGE: 1988 AND BEYOND	195
ENROLLMENT	198
FINANCE	199
CURRICULUM	202
MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION	206
POLICY	212
ANALYSIS	215
CONCLUSIONS	218
TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION	219
BIBLIOGRAPHY	227

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Valley View District 96's Wealth During the 1960's	44
2. Valley View District 96's Local Tax Rate in the 1960's	45
3. Cost Per Pupil Savings	52
4. Valley View District 365U's Wealth During the 1970's	128
5. Valley View District 365U's Local Tax Rate in the 1970's	129
6. Valley View's Local Tax Rate in the 1980's . .	141
7. Valley View District Wealth During the 1980's .	147
8. Sources of Revenue 1980-1987	149
9. Change in Math Achievement	158
10. Change in Reading Achievement	158
11. Change in English Achievement	158

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains a description of the purpose, procedure and sources, limitations, definitions, and a review of research on effective schools and Management By Objectives. It provides background information about the research study for the reader. Education has gone through many changes in the past fifteen years. The early seventies focused on the child as an individual who was curious and should be allowed to explore and learn through his/her own interests. Open education, open space learning environments, individualized instruction, and self-directed learning were popular educational innovations. As the eighties emerged, accountability for student learning and educational reform became the focus and the center of attention. Valley View Community Unit District 365U responded to the need for accountability and a focus on student learning in the seventies. The result was continued improvement of student learning over the next fourteen years. This research study explores the elements that enabled the improvement to occur and to be maintained over time.

PURPOSE

In Valley View Community Unit District 365U significant growth in student achievement took place over the past fourteen years in spite of rapidly increasing enrollment and limited financial resources. Initially the impact was seen in the elementary grades, but the trend became evident in the middle and high schools as well. This achievement was remarkable since the district was the tenth largest in the state of Illinois and had one of the lowest assessed valuations for its size. The purpose of this historical study is to identify the key elements that were implemented fourteen years ago which enabled the growth in student achievement to take place. Through an analysis of policies, practices, and organizational management, the study will define the criteria of excellence and its successful application in Valley View District 365U.

Bolingbrook and Romeoville were two communities in the 1960s and 1970s that experienced rapid residential growth which resulted in a school population explosion. Since the growth was mainly residential, the assessed valuation per pupil dropped rapidly. The district went from being one of the wealthiest in the state (based on assessed valuation per pupil) to one of the poorest. The district could not fund the building of sufficient schools to meet the demand. They therefore developed the 45/15 Year-Round School Plan in an

effort to accommodate the growing student population.

With the influx of students and the housing shortage, there was instability as to which schools the students attended, double sessions, and poor student achievement. In 1974 the Board of Education decided to take action to improve the education of the students. The new Assistant Superintendent of Instruction and the resulting changes in curriculum, instructional supervision, and organizational management brought about dramatic improvement of student learning. This improvement has lasted over fourteen years and has resulted in the recognition of excellence by the U.S. Department of Education.

In these times of reform and accountability, examples of excellence, which can be replicated, need to be identified to assist other schools in creating effective and productive learning environments for children. Schools, which have reached the goal of excellence in student learning, have an even more difficult task ahead of them -- the continuation of excellence through the renewal and empowerment of teachers and staff. Achieving excellence was the first goal, maintaining it over time required a different focus and approach.

PROCEDURE AND SOURCES

The procedures utilized in this research included a review of the effective schools and organizational management literature, an investigation of the history of both communities, and a review of various documents such as board of education minutes, student achievement reports, books, memoranda, newspaper articles, financial reports, etc., to determine the areas which had direct influence on student learning.

Once the review of the documents was completed, the areas of focus were categorized into two groups: those over which the district had control and those over which the district had little or no control. The key issues, concepts, elements were then identified and investigated further to determine the impact and interaction of each upon student learning. The review of the effective schools literature, the MBO literature, and the guidelines for excellence from the U.S. Department of Education helped determine the criteria for excellence.

Finally, the authenticity of the information in the chapters was verified by Dr. David Pankake (former Assistant Superintendent of Instruction), Mr. Paul Swinford (school district Treasurer), and Mr. Ronald Strahanoski (school district Business Manager).

The following primary sources were utilized: Board of Education minutes, student achievement reports, a federally

funded project report, end-of-year and quarterly curriculum management reports, district generated guidelines, memoranda, newspapers, district newsletters, letters, agendas and materials from workshops, village comprehensive plans, census reports, and books. Some secondary source materials were used mainly in the research of effective schools and organizational management literature.

Chapter Two describes the history of both communities up until 1974. This chapter provides the reader with background information that is necessary to understand the impact that residential growth had on Valley View Elementary District 96 and Lockport Township High School District 205. It also presents the rationale for the formation of High School District 211 and then Valley View Community Unit District 365U one year later. The chapter also explains the need for the implementation of the 45/15 Year-Round School Year Plan.

Chapter Three details the changes that were implemented with the hiring of Dr. Pankake as Assistant Superintendent of Instruction. The instructional and organizational changes were the impetus for the improvement of student achievement. The chapter ends in 1979 when the district decided to return to the nine-month school year.

Chapter Four covers 1980 until 1988. During this time the focus of the improvement was instructional alignment -- the techniques and the skills of the teachers. Staff

development became a new area of emphasis. There was a change of superintendents and the retirement of Dr. Pankake.

Chapter Five summarizes and formulates conclusions about the research study. It also offers to the district suggested topics of consideration for continuing the progress achieved to date and for helping to maintain the dedication to the vision and mission that started in 1974.

Each chapter contains the following elements: enrollment and housing, curriculum, management organization, student achievement, finance, and policy. The order in which they are presented may change because the priorities of the times changed. There are some additional elements presented in each chapter that are unique to that particular time period.

LIMITATIONS

No study is without some limitations. This study has the following:

1. The accuracy of board minutes. These are public documents where the information has been recorded by a person. Therefore, there is a degree of interpretation as to what is important to record and what not to record. In addition, due to the political nature of some decisions, the minutes may not reflect the complete discussion. It may be a summary instead.

2. The availability of archive material. The records kept by various departments are not always stored on microfiche. In many cases they are destroyed after three years. Hard copies of Board of Education were readily accessible; however, access to the material stored on microfiche or elsewhere was not permitted.
3. Bias of the material used, those authenticating the accuracy of the dissertation, and of the author of the study. Objectivity in reporting historical material is important. Every person who experiences the events, reports about the events, about the significance of them, and describes them has his/her own perceptions. The author has been employed by the district for eighteen years and has personal experience with the changes that have taken place. There is a certain bias from that experience that must be open to possible modification if the reporting is to be objective.
4. The current nature of part of the research. Information within the past two or three years may not be part of the archives nor be centrally stored. It also may be too new to provide perspective as to its impact on topic of the research.

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions are presented to provide a common understanding and framework of reference for the reader of this research study:

Assessed Valuation: The total value of real property within the school district on which taxes are levied.

Bond Retirement Schedule: the repayment schedule for long term borrowing of money.

Curriculum Alignment: The organization of learning objectives, evaluation measures, and instructional materials to maximize student learning.

Effective Schools: a process whereby improvement in student learning is brought about by joint planning and problem solving to reach the goal of helping students to learn more.

Excellence: The continued improvement of student learning over time whether the criteria be student achievement tests, the percentage of students at or above grade level in reading, mathematics, and language arts, or the level of mastery on district curriculum objectives.

45/15 Year-Round Plan: a school schedule of attendance where students attend school on a staggered nine-weeks on and three-weeks off pattern over a twelve month period of time.

Instructional Alignment: The implementation of research-based instructional techniques which have a positive correlation with improving student achievement.

Management By Objectives: a management system which utilizes setting objectives, developing an action plan to reach them, specifying whose responsible for each component, and measuring the outcome of the plan.

Open Space: an environmental plan where schools have few interior walls. Space is flexible and teachers work together with a group of students.

Shadowing: a technique whereby a person is followed throughout his/her normal day to investigate and gain insight into the internal operations of an organization.

Tax Anticipation Warrants: The borrowing of money based on the anticipation of the collection of taxes.

Tax Levy: The taxes imposed by a governmental agency.

Tracks: geographic assignment of students for the purpose of attendance.

Year-Round School: a school calendar where the mandated number of school attendance days are distributed throughout the twelve months instead of nine.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS RESEARCH

The effective schools movement started twenty-four years ago when the Coleman Report on the Equality of Educational Opportunity was published. The purpose of the

Coleman Report was to assess the equality of educational opportunity in public schools. In his report Coleman presented the premise that the available educational resources to children from black and poor families were almost equal to those available to white children of middle class families. However, the family's socioeconomic background was the main determiner of student achievement and that the school had little effect. The results of this report stimulated debate among researchers and educators thereby serving as the catalyst for further research and reanalysis of his data. After reanalyzing the data, some critics reached the same conclusion that schools do not make a difference. Another group of researchers did not accept Coleman's conclusions and believed that Coleman did not account for those internal factors that make the difference in schools.

The follow-up research focused on finding urban schools that were effective in educating the black and the poor children, identifying the characteristics of those schools, and comparing school inputs (personnel, climate, and social makeup) with outputs (achievement, self-concept, and self-reliance). Schools were investigated to see if performance could be predicted on non-school variables like student, home, and community demographic characteristics. In 1974 Klitgaard and Hall conducted the first large-scale study to identify if effective schools existed.

In the decade that followed, there were three methods of research. The initial search was for urban schools serving similar populations where schools had overcome the negative effects of poverty. These were identified as "overachieving" schools -- schools where students achieved above average on basic skills. Once identified, a more in depth study was conducted to determine the characteristics contributing to the success. According to Lynn Olson in Education Week, it was impossible to predict who was poor and who was not by looking at the test scores. One team who utilized this approach was Edmonds and Frederickson in their 1978 study of twenty effective schools serving poor children. Common factors were found -- an orderly, quiet atmosphere, principals who monitored student progress, teachers who took responsibility for the instructional effectiveness, clear goals and learning objectives, principals with strong leadership, management, and instructional strength. In Madden's forty-two school study in 1976, the focus was on the identification of factors that differentiated more effective schools from less effective. Again similar factors were found.

Another focus was to analyze randomly selected schools across all socioeconomic populations to identify the relationships between input and output factors. Brookover and others in 1979 assessed the importance on inputs on outputs. He found that personnel inputs, the school social

structure, and school climate had significant impact on reading and math achievement, the student's self-concept of academic ability, and pupil self-reliance.

A third approach was to request nominations of effective schools and then investigate them. One researcher in this search was Weber who investigated the beginning reading programs of four inner-city schools in 1971. He found eight school and program characteristics: strong leadership, high expectations, good atmosphere (climate), emphasis on reading, extra reading personnel, phonics instruction, modification of assignments to meet student needs, and careful, frequent evaluation of student progress.

The overall outcome of this was the determination that schools can and do make a difference. Ron Edmonds, late professor at Harvard University Graduate School of Education, has been named the first leader of the effective schools movement. He listed five main features of all effective schools:

1. A clear and broadly understood academic focus or school mission.
2. Careful monitoring of student achievement as a basis for program evaluation.
3. Teachers who believe that all students can master the curriculum and exhibit high expectations to reach that goal.

4. A safe and orderly school climate conducive to learning.
5. A principal who is an instructional leader, paying particular attention to the quality of learning and teaching in his/her school.

From 1976-1980 a definition of effective schools began to emerge. Olson, in 1986, reported it as "a process, not a program, for creating change based on joint problem-solving and a set of commonly held beliefs, norms, and practices."¹ Mace-Matluck of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory defined it as "one in which the conditions are such that student achievement data show that all students evidence an acceptable minimum mastery of those essential basic skills that are a prerequisite to success at the next level of schooling."² The end result of the research pointed to the fact that effective schools do exist for poor children and that the focus of the research needed to be on school policies, expectations, and leadership.

Ron Edmonds believed that "these characteristics that describe effective schools are practical, they're obtainable, and if we're serious enough and systematic and

¹Lynn Olson, "Effective Schools," Education Week, 15 January 1986, 12.

²Betty Mace-Matluck, *The Effective Schools Movement: Its History and Context* (Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1987), 11.

thoughtful enough it means they can come to describe all of the schools that we work in."³

As research continued, one of the predominate, recurring factors has been the leadership behavior of principals. This stimulated further study through shadowing students to gain further insight into the internal operations of schools. The purpose was to determine the effectiveness or ineffectiveness factors, and through studying schools that met certain criteria, the impact of leadership behavior.

James Sweeney, Associate Professor At Iowa State University, reviewed eight studies to identify which leadership behaviors were associated with positive outcomes. The eight studies were Weber's 1971 study of reading in four inner-city schools, the New York Performance Review study in 1974, Madden's 1976 study of California schools, Wellisch's 1978 study of the impact of the Emergency School Aid Act, Edmonds' 1978 research to identify and analyze effective urban schools, the study by Brookover in 1979 on school social systems and student achievement, Rutter's 1979 secondary schools study, and Edmonds' New York City school improvement project study. Sweeney's conclusions were that principals who emphasize instruction, are assertive,

³Tamara Thompson, "Are Your Schools Really Effective? Research Pinpoints What Makes Schools Successful," Illinois School Board Journal (March-April 1986): 27.

results-oriented, and provide a safe and orderly environment will see improved student achievement. These are very consistent findings when compared to Ron Edmonds' five correlates. Combine the two and they provide direction for educators who want to improve the quality of education for children.

In the 1980s as the call for reform became stronger and more prevalent, the effective schools movement became a nationwide drive into suburban and rural areas to change mediocre or ineffective schools into effective ones based on the research results. Support has been shown by the federal government with 1750 school districts and 7500 schools being served by thirty-nine separate effective-school projects that were federally funded. The Education Commission of the States estimated that there were twenty states sponsoring voluntary or mandated school-improvement projects, the majority of which use effective-school strategies. In addition the National Institute of Education established two research centers (one elementary and one secondary) on effective schools.

In 1985 Fullan conducted a study on Change Processes and Strategies at the Local level. He further delineated school effectiveness factors into two subgroups, organizational and process. The eight organizational factors are:

1. School level leadership focused on instruction

2. Support from the district level
3. Emphasis on curriculum and instruction
4. Clear goals and high expectations for students
5. Monitored performance and achievement
6. Ongoing staff development
7. Support and involvement from parents
8. Safe and orderly environment

The four process factors are:

1. A feel for the improvement process
2. A guiding value system
3. Intense interaction and communication
4. Collaborative planning and implementation

More recently research in education has been coupled with research in business practices and leadership. A 1988 article by Richard DeFour and Robert Eaker in The Developer expands the five correlates by Edmonds and Lezotte into nine. These are:

1. A clear vision
2. Day to day operations guided by a few shared central values
3. Effective leadership
4. Principals are managers of climate
5. The curriculum reflects the values of the school and provides a focus to teachers
6. The schools promote excellence in teaching
7. What is important is monitored

8. The commitment to improvement is continued through self-renewal
9. The core values are celebrated with ceremonies and rituals

Other studies have expanded into the middle and high school levels to ascertain components of effective schools (California Study, 1984, and Biniaminov and Glasman, 1983). Another outgrowth has been the cooperative involvement among institutions of high learning, private foundations, and public schools. The current impetus has been in the areas of change strategies (Fullan, 1985, and Huberman, 1981), resources available to districts, descriptions of effective school programs, and since 1985 identification of indicators or measures of school effectiveness (U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics).

The movement has become so strong that a comment by Gershon M. Ratner, attorney for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, in the Texas Law Review was indicative of the national mood on the subject. He stated,

Enough public schools serving sizable populations of poor and minority students in enough different locations nationwide have successfully taught the vast majority of these students basic skills within existing budgets, and the evidence of common characteristics and replicability is so strong, that the purported justifications for failure are no longer defensible.⁴

⁴Lynn Olson, "Effective Schools," 12

The movement's reputations for improving student achievement as measured by standardized achievement tests was one of the key reasons for its popularity according to Lezotte. With the scarcity of resources that schools have been facing, another attractive feature was the implication that schools can become effective without the influx of new money. Effective schools made better use of the resources at hand.

In 1982 the United States Department of Education initiated a program to recognize excellence in the nation's secondary schools. Secretary Bennett's goal was to recognize those secondary schools who had exemplary programs, policies, and practices as models of excellence for the nation. Over the three years from 1982-1985, 571 schools were honored for their excellence.

In 1985 Secretary Bennett expanded the program and designated 1985-1986 as the "Year of the Elementary School". He wanted to recognize those elementary schools who were exceptional in providing all of their children a solid foundation of basic skills, knowledge of subject matter, as well as developing character, values, and ethical judgment. In the spring of 1986, 212 elementary public schools were honored by President Reagan at a ceremony in Washington, D.C. These schools were evaluated on quality of school organization, quality of building leadership, quality of instructional program and curriculum, quality of

instruction, quality of school climate, quality of school-community relations, quality of efforts towards improvement and maintenance of high quality programs, and quality of student outcomes. There were no standards set, but the school was evaluated on how it met the local needs and circumstances.

In May 1988, Wood View Elementary School was named as a model of excellence in the Elementary School Recognition Program for 1987-1988. At the local celebration in September, 1988, Under-Secretary Linus Wright commended Wood View and Valley View Community Unit District for its excellence particularly since the fiscal resources are limited. The Department of Education was especially impressed with what had been accomplished with so little. Currently West View Middle School has been selected as one of the state finalists and is now in the nationwide assessment. In 1986 Secretary Bennett summed up effective schooling very well. He said,

Excellence is found in the most affluent suburbs and in the midst of oppressive poverty. While adopting measures to lift the general level of America's elementary schools and paying special attention to those who need help the most, we should keep in mind that excellence can be achieved anywhere.⁵

Glen Robinson, president and director of research at Educational Research Service, stated that "it is now

⁵Bruce L. Wilson and Thomas B. Corcoran, "Places Where Children Succeed: A Profile of Outstanding Elementary Schools," Research for Better Schools, December 1987, 1.

unacceptable for a school district to have a school that is not effective in terms of student learning and for which there is not a well-developed plan of action for turning the school around."⁶

Dr. Henry M. Brickell and Regina Paul coauthored a book, Time For Curriculum. The book stressed the roles that the board and the professionals play in developing curriculum and improving student learning. The process was developed around the concept of a dial clock. The curriculum clock was divided into four main sections and one subsection. Twelve o'clock was selecting goals and objectives (planned ENDS), three o'clock was selecting programs (planned MEANS), six o'clock was operating programs (actual MEANS), nine o'clock was measuring goals and objectives (actual ENDS), and ten-thirty was setting standards which accompanies measuring goals and objectives.

The main premise was the distinction between the board's areas of responsibility and those of the professionals'. While the board did not actually do the work, their approval of the work gave it the letter of law and what was expected to be accomplished. The board was directly accountable to the taxpayers for the goals and objectives and the results produced by the professionals.

⁶Tamara Thompson, "Are Your Schools Really Effective?"
27.

It set the direction and expectations for the professionals to follow.

The professionals were responsible and had decision-making power for selecting and operating programs. What was done in this area had a direct impact upon the results. Dr. Brickell strongly encouraged conversations and advice being shared between the two areas, but that there be no confusion as to who has ultimate power and control in each.

In setting goals and objectives, the objectives must be measurable since they were the guarantees of what would be learned. Second, they must not be repeated verbatim from grade level to grade level. They must specify what was meant by "can add with 80 percent accuracy" for each grade level. This spiraled the curriculum by increasing the level of difficulty gradually without omitting some component. This helped ensure that students were progressing, not relearning the same thing year after year. The topic could repeat, but not the specific objective. The objectives were to be at the grade level where 75 percent could master them. Third, the goals and objectives must be planned for progress and for those who can learn them. Brickell and Paul caution that districts must determine what will be learned, not a textbook company or the state mandates. Either one of these two would give only a minimum expectation curriculum. Last, differentiation was needed between core objectives which

were required for everyone and the optional ones. Required courses must be separated from the elective ones.

One last thought about this area was to develop a pacing chart that told teachers when each objective was to be taught and evaluated. This step stressed the seriousness of the objectives. It helped prevent them from being put on a shelf or in a drawer, forgotten, and learning proceeding as before. Everyone from the teacher to the principal to the superintendent was accountable throughout the year, not just at the end.

Selecting programs was strictly in the realm of the professionals since it involved their area of expertise. Boards could observe and ask questions, but they couldn't control it. In order of priority, programs consisted of teachers, parents, time allocation, materials, methods, and places. Teachers had the greatest realm of influence. The goal of the superintendent was to get parents to behave like the best parents. Parents helped determine how a child applied his/her intelligence in school and whether achievement would measure up to potential achievement. Brickell believed that the background of the parents was a better predictor of student achievement than intelligence.

Materials usually began with the textbook and then included a variety of resources. The results of learning were one indicator as to whether the correct resources were chosen. How the materials were used must be included as

well since the best material may not do the job in the hands of a teacher who does not use it or does not use it well.

Much has been written on methods of teaching. The most prominent was Madeline Hunter's seven step lesson design. Most people would agree that the key was guided practice over time. Teaching was the means to getting students to do something that they have never done before and remembering it. Adequate guided practice was diagnostic and helped remove mistakes before the student worked independently.

The location where instruction takes place was the least important component. A good teacher with materials would teach well anywhere. A board must be aware of the physical plant and the surroundings where teachers must work since there was a psychological factor involved. But a safe, orderly, clean environment was sufficient for instruction to take place. If the hygiene factors were satisfactory, then the place had little to do with the major, influential elements of instruction.

With the objectives and the program selection in place, the curriculum clock came to the most critical part of the cycle -- the act of teaching. The teacher must orchestrate time, methods, materials, pacing of objectives, student motivation, attitudes of him/herself and the students about learning, and guidelines. Every teacher was different in how learning was approached, what materials and techniques worked best, how closely the blueprint of learning was

followed, and how successful they were themselves in school. This area was a major focus in the 1980s after objectives, program selection, and evaluation was in place. Dr. Brickell did not believe that teaching can be controlled since it was such an individual art and so little was known about what works. Information is available about what works in learning so more of it can be controlled. There must be a match between the curriculum plan and the instruction for success to be achieved. In many cases the choices made at the program selection stage will determine what the outcome is in operating the program.

Finally, the level of expected performance and the means with which to measure it must be decided upon. At a 1987 seminar on effective schools, Berliner pointed out that tests must match what is taught. If they don't, there is no sense in testing the students. You will only confirm what you already know -- the students will not perform well. A national test should have about a 60 percent overlap with the curriculum to be an appropriate independent audit.

Hand in hand with measuring the objectives was setting the standards of performance. This was the board's area of control. They, not the administration nor the teachers, should set the standards. Not being professionals, the board would focus on results instead of how to achieve them. Boards would typically expect more and try to provide the financial support to achieve it.

MANAGEMENT BY OBJECTIVES

In the business world a similar revolution took place. The management system for business was less than satisfactory since evaluation of a manager's performance was based on the degree to which the person did or did not possess a variety of subjective traits. Examples were cost awareness, initiative, innovation, loyalty, punctuality, cooperation, and potential. In 1954 Peter Drucker initiated Management By Objectives. He made objectives and results the basis for the management system and utilized a systems approach to managing the organization. Evaluation became measurable and tied to results. The end result was improved communications, coordination, control, and motivation. He did indicate that the change would be evident after two or three years of usage since the manager's behavior was being changed from "doing" to "managing."

Management By Objectives (MBO) is comprised of five steps: assessment to identify potential objectives, the selection of the objectives, the plan to accomplish them (includes time, resources, methods, materials, etc.), implementation, and monitoring of the results. Inherent to all five steps is the planning and setting of high but attainable objectives with the participation of all personnel.

MBO goes through a three stage evolution. First is the improvement of management's performance through goals and recognition for achievements. Next is the use of MBO for short range organizational effectiveness. Last is the long range effectiveness by balancing and directing results of the individual manager for organizational priorities.

As Lynn Olson pointed out about effective schools, Dale McConkey stressed that MBO was a process not a program. It changed the operating behavior of people and their focus. Instead of goals being written as "wanting to improve student performance," MBO enabled the district to be more specific. For example, "student achievement will increase by 10 percent in reading by the end of the year." The emphasis by all managerial personnel was to accomplish that specific goal. Finally involvement of all personnel was necessary to improve the organization as a whole by meeting the goals. The control factor to make sure that time and attention was spent doing the "right things" was the monitoring of progress periodically. The process included defining the jobs of all people involved so there was less duplication of effort or no effort at all due to communication errors.

McConkey believed that the best results came from a balanced, participative style that encouraged maximum participation. It required self-direction, self-management, self-control, and self-discipline. He described the virtues of management by objectives as "a rifle approach to

achieving desired results rather than a scattergun approach in which many managers dissipate their time and effort keeping busy on unnecessary and routine activities."⁷ Douglas McGregor described the most successful style of management as:

to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts towards organizational objectives. This is a process primarily of creating opportunities, releasing potential, removing obstacles, encouraging growth, providing guidance. It was what Peter Drucker had called "Management by Objectives" in contrast to "Management by Control."⁸

According to Drucker, managers spend 80 percent of their time on the critical 20 percent of the tasks requiring attention. As Peter Drucker stated, "it is the difference between doing things right and doing the right things."⁹

This approach was used by Douglas McGregor of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Rensis Likierth of University of Michigan to justify the application of modern behavioral research to business situations.

MBO had its pitfalls like any other process involving people. Failure has usually been attributed to trying to do too much too fast, telling people what the objectives were, omitting the staff officers and including only the line

⁷Dale McConkey, How to Manage by Results, 3rd ed. (New York: American Management Associations, 1976), 17.

⁸Dale McConkey, How to Manage by Results, 25.

⁹Peter F. Drucker, Managing for Results (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), vii.

officers, believing that MBO was a panacea, executives delegating direction and guidance, creating a paper mill of forms and reports, ignoring feedback, emphasizing process more than product. Other factors were not rewarding effort nor results, omitting the plan for accomplishing the objectives, refusal to be flexible in the approach or operation, isolating the objectives and people from the operation of the whole system, stressing short term objectives at the expense of long term objectives, omitting periodic reviews, lack of ongoing training and inservice, reluctance to take risks, and refusal to delegate. Failure was rarely the goal of an organization, but through ignorance or the design, it could happen. In any situation competent managers will avoid these pitfalls or recognize the early warning signs.

Three of the earliest schools to adopt MBO were the Management Institute of the University of Wisconsin-Extension in Madison, Holt School District in Holt, Michigan, and William Rainey Harper college in Palatine, Illinois. All three met with success after implementing the system. Successes have included increased enrollment and programs due to increased quality, decentralization of services, and the translation of the educational process into a scientific procedure to improve the services of the teachers and the achievement of students. McConkey pointed

out that MBO was applicable to all types of organizations only if they accepted and met these basic premises:

1. Highly competent managers, administrators and professionals are in key positions.
2. Indepth training is provided before any implementation is made.
3. The organization accepts the fact that successful implementation will take three to four years.
4. There is maximum participation of all personnel.
5. MBO is adapted to the unique characteristics and/or problems of the organization.
6. The organization removes all counter-productive practices such as recognizing and awarding efforts rather than results, inflexibility, the lack of recognition and rewards.
7. On-going evaluation and modification of the process to meet the organizational needs.

In the early 1970s Management By Objectives and Planning Programming Budgeting System models were popular. The demands for accountability by various states made these management approaches attractive because they focused on goals and objectives which could then be evaluated. Outcomes based programs, individualized instruction, curriculum alignment, and effective teaching behavior all became very popular.

In the 1980s, organizational management literature focused on excellence. Some of the foremost authors were Peters and Waterman, Warren Benis and Burt Nanus, and Lee Iococca. Themes in these books focused on management style, leadership style, communication, vision, recognition, and reward.

James Lewis Jr. bridged the research in business with research in education. In his book, Achieving Excellence in Education, he summarized key elements of excellent companies and translated them into actions that education can incorporate to achieve similar results.

His book was based on the theory of "success-emulation." Briefly the theory meant that success could be achieved by studying what was being done by other successful entities and adopting or modifying those that were appropriate for the organization. Advantages of utilizing this philosophy were mainly financial. Someone else had already spent the time, money, and energy to find out what works, and it maximized limited resources. In other words, don't reinvent the wheel.

The first lesson was to identify and support school champions. These were persons who were motivators, problem solvers, risk-oriented, and sometimes troublemakers in their persistence to reach their goal. They were the keys to school improvement, needed to have the environment in which to function, and they must be understood and protected.

There were four categories of champions: teaching, program, executive, and godfather. Teaching champions were those whose style yielded excellent student results and were highly regarded and referred to as a model. Program champions were usually principals or central administrators who produced and supported a program which produced excellent results for students. They tended to be risk takers and would be assertive about the program. Executive champions were principals and higher school administrators who supported and protected other school champions. They would highlight what the teaching champions had achieved and the benefit to the district as a result of their efforts. Finally godfather champions were usually superintendents who looked for championship characteristics in administrators and served as a mentor to them.

Support meant to provide opportunities, either permanent or temporary, within the schools and the system for the champions to work with others to improve instruction. Suggestions from Lewis included giving them opportunities to find problems in the school district and solve them, providing a non-threatening, non-punitive environment to discuss problems and possible solutions for the school or district, and identifying and recognizing the champions for their accomplishments and contributions. Most important of all was to tolerate and nurture failure. Peters and Waterman supported this position and believed

that "tolerance for failure is a very specific part of the excellent company culture, and lessons come directly from the top."¹⁰

Lesson two was to establish a suggestion program that was supported with money and awards. The program must focus on how to improve student learning and how to save money. Included must be a feedback component for rejected ideas.

Lesson three related to transforming philosophy into culture. The statement of philosophy was articulated not only by words but with behaviors. The principles and guidelines must be integrated into the pattern of behavior. To bring this transition about, a plan must be developed that addresses changing behaviors. The plan may take two to three years to complete, but the long range results may be worth the investment of time and patience. Key to the training in the philosophy was the interaction and involvement of everyone in the various activities. Periodic assessment of progress was necessary to ascertain if the desired change in norms and values were being accomplished.

To reach any goal, communications, lesson four, must be open and two-way (up and down the chain of command). There were several means by which to accomplish this goal. One was to schedule formal meetings quarterly and annually to discuss the goals and what progress was being made towards

¹⁰James Lewis Jr., Achieving Excellence in Our Schools (New York: Wilkerson Publishing Company, 1986), 15.

them. Another was to establish formal committees with overlapping membership.

In the informal realm, an open door policy, visible management (walking around, wandering around, socializing), and one-minute management were three options. Assess, analyze, and plan for improvement to have open, beneficial communication. Recognize those who do this well.

Lesson five stressed decisions by consensus to gain support and commitment by all involved or affected by the decision. The people would understand the rationale and have some ownership in the decision. This leads to improved morale. Everyone wins.

Kids as customers was the theme of lesson six. Top companies were close to their customers. Schools must be close to their kids through involving them in problem solving, teachers and administrators walking around and talking to them, being available when needed, meeting kid's needs, and assessing progress in this area. Other suggestions were quality circles, surveying graduates as to how the district prepared them, close involvement with parents, and publicize what is being done.

Training and development was emphasized in lesson seven. Schools must not assume that the degree, be it undergraduate or graduate, prepared the person for teaching or administration. As in business, ongoing in-house training was necessary for employees to reach their

potential. The opportunity and motivation must be there for them. A recommended 1 percent of the yearly budget was suggested with allocation of personnel to oversee the program. Critical to the program was the orientation of new personnel to the history, current programs, philosophy, and the role and expectation of the people. A new teacher should have a mentor to help develop the level of excellence expected. For experienced teachers, design the program to continue their learning. Develop and provide a career-path program and opportunities to observe and assist in the areas of their interest and the needs of the district.

The superintendent was addressed in lesson nine. Lewis strongly suggested hiring a generalist rather than a specialist. The generalist would spend equal time and energy in all areas of district operations. The specialist would tend to spend more time in the area s/he was familiar with and knew how to do. This was true of other administrators also. The one specialty that was required was the dedication to achieving excellence. In a district that grew its own generalists, a pool of potential superintendents was available for the future. Help administrators develop a career path that will also be of benefit to the long range needs of the district and gradually increase the level of complexity.

Lewis pointed out that one area of neglect in education was recognizing and awarding excellence (lesson ten). Best-

run businesses recognized from 10 to 60 percent of the employees. This encouraged people to become one of the "winners" and stimulated achievement. True, it also resulted in negative comments, but it raised the level of anxiety and attention to the goal of excellence. Again that which gets attention, improves. Administrators must be sensitive to the small gains or efforts by those who have not received recognition and positively recognize the beginning efforts. As Drucker has stressed in his management literature, keep your time and attention on the 80 percent who are performing for you, not on the 20 percent who are not. Don't ignore them, encourage them to join the rest, but don't expend the majority of time and energy on them.

Suggested areas for recognition were those students and teachers who had reached the performance standards for learning, those with perfect attendance for the year or several years, those who had created and implemented innovative techniques or programs leading to excellence, those with exemplary performance, those with a high degree of loyalty and teamwork, and those who had helped get grant money. The idea was to reward many, not a few. Motivation came from the belief that it was possible to reach the reward and become part of the group. Not many people believed that they could become part of the elite, but would strive to be part of the majority.

Lesson eleven addressed the issue of using teams to problem solve, develop the sense of unity, and reduce the need for more administrators. This increased the individual's sense of worth and contribution and helped him/her become part of the winners. Inherent in this approach was training in how to work as a team, specific purposes and goals for the team, supportive organizational practices, autonomy to operate, and the type of relationship that develops among the members.

The purpose of these lessons was to point out that innovation, creativity, intrapreneurship were necessary to enable the organization to continue growing and meeting the varying needs of society. To maintain high levels of performance the focus has to be on the people doing the job. The tasks, organization, expectations, tools, and results are already present. People achieve excellence and maintain it, not organizations. Lewis states,

the higher the degree of education and maturity of the people involved, the more intrapreneurship they show. If this is indeed true, then individual and team self-management should work wonders in our schools because of the high level of education and maturity of school people.¹¹

This approach was successful because the assumption was that everyone was sufficiently well qualified to do their job in a correct manner without close supervision.

¹¹James Lewis Jr., Achieving Excellence in Our Schools (New York: Wilkerson Publishing Company, 1986), 161.

Chapter One presented the outline of the research, a set of definition, and a review of the related literature. Chapter Two develops the history of the two communities and of the school districts. It leads to the formation of Valley View Community Unit District 365U and the reasons behind the changes that were made beginning in 1974.

CHAPTER II

VALLEY VIEW DISTRICT PRIOR TO 1974

Change, innovation, rapid community growth, scarcity of resources, community factions, poor student achievement -- all of these characteristics typify the early years of Bolingbrook and Romeoville and their relationship with Lockport High School District 205. In the educational community, non-graded schooling, open education, open space schools, student decision making, individualized instruction, Initial Teaching Alphabet, and new math were the popular methodologies. In 1974 the Board of Education for Valley View Community Unit District 365U made a commitment to improve the quality of education and of student achievement.

This chapter traces the history of Elementary District 96, Lockport High School District 205, Valley View High School District 211, and Valley View Community Unit District 365U. In addition it reviews the events leading up to the commitment to improve student achievement. Included in the chapter is the formation of Valley View High School District 211 and Valley View Community Unit District 365U, the implementation of 45/15 Year-Round School Plan, finance,

policy, curriculum/instruction, open space schools, and student achievement.

The circumstances leading to the formation of Valley View Community District 365U lend insight into some of the variables that have influenced the education of children in the Bolingbrook/Romeoville communities since 1953.

This area began developing as a residential community in the 1950s at an incredible rate and didn't stop until the interest rates went to almost 20 percent in the mid seventies. Today the district has an excellent reputation as an educational institution for regular education children and for those with special needs. In addition the U.S. Department of Education selected Wood View Elementary School as a model of excellence in May of 1988. The purpose of this paper is to identify what key elements enabled Valley View to achieve excellence in spite of the variables and constraints with which it has had to deal over the past fourteen years.

DISTRICT 96

Elementary District 96 (grades one through eight) was formed in May 1953, as a result of a merger of six one room school districts (Hopkins 93, Spangler 95, Sprague 99, Chapman 102, Graves 103 and Barbers Corners 194), 89 students, five teachers, and three members of the Board of Education. According to William Rogge in his final report,

Planning a Year-Round School Operation, the new district covered over forty square miles in Will County just adjacent to Cook and DuPage Counties. The 8 August 1971 issue of the Columbia Daily Tribune states that District 365U was the fourth richest district (based on Assessed Valuation per pupil) in 1961. By 1971 it had dropped to 418th. Two communities, Bolingbrook and Romeoville, were to become the major sites for growth and building since they were located on either side of Interstate 55 which connects St. Louis, Springfield, and Chicago.

Romeoville was incorporated in 1901, but did not reach a population of two hundred until 1950. During the 1950s substantial residential subdivision building caused the village's population to soar to 3,574. During the next decade construction continued, and the population reached 13,000 by 1970. Romeoville grew at a faster rate than the neighboring communities of Orland Park, Lemont, Lockport, and Crest Hill. Many of the families moved from Cook County with the majority being from Chicago. In the 1960s over half of Romeoville's population was under the age of eighteen while Will County had 32 percent of its population under the age of eighteen. The median age for Romeoville was 17.7 years and twenty-six years for Will County.

The 1971 Village of Romeoville Comprehensive Plan states that the families moving into the area had similar socioeconomic characteristics to those families moving into

Lemont, Lockport, Crest Hill and Will County as a whole. In 1968 the median family income was \$9,764 as compared to Crest Hill at \$8,958 and Lockport at \$9,881. The median price of homes for the three communities ranged from \$16,363 to \$21,188. According to John Strobbe, Mayor of Romeoville, Romeoville's residential construction was completed by 1974. However, Romeoville's population continued to grow. Between 1970 and 1980 the population increased by 22 percent with nearly half of the residents being under the age of eighteen.

Needless to say the impact of students on the school system was significant. The elementary and junior high students attended District 96 then attended Lockport High School District 205. By 1969 the K-8 enrollment had gone from 89 students to 5,590. There were three elementary buildings (K-6) and one building of junior high students (7 and 8). Valley View Elementary School, built in 1954 with a major addition built in 1959, had a total of thirty-one classrooms (capacity 900). Park View Elementary School (now R.C. Hill School) was built in 1962 with a major addition in 1964 giving a total of forty-two classrooms (capacity 1200). Ridge View Elementary School (now Irene King School), built in 1969, had sixteen classrooms (capacity 480). West View Junior High, built in 1965, had thirty-eight classrooms (capacity 1200).

For high school the students attended Lockport West in Romeoville which was part of Lockport High School District 205. This district encompassed Romeoville, Bolingbrook, Lockport, and Crest Hill. Lockport West (now Romeoville High School) was built in 1962 and had fifty-five to sixty classrooms. By the end of 1969-1970 school year class sizes ranged in the two districts from thirty to thirty-one in District 96 to forty-one in District 205. All of the schools were operating above their rated capacity, ranging from about 5 percent at Ridge View to over 90 percent at Lockport West.

Incorporated in 1965 with only two subdivisions and a population of 5,357, Bolingbrook (originally Barbers Corners) grew at an even greater rate than Romeoville. According to the 1984 Bolingbrook Resource Book, the Decennial Census in 1970 reflected a population of 8,504, a special census in 1972 showed 15,508, and for two more years the village grew by almost 5,000 residents per year. In 1974 the population reached 25,519. From 1972 until 1977 a special census was conducted yearly to track the growth of the community. The growth in the 1970s increased the village population by over 400 percent. 58 percent of the residents were under the age of eighteen and the median age was eighteen years. The median family income in 1970 was \$12,070 with homes in the \$15,000 to \$38,000 price range.

FINANCE

The influx of students quickly depleted District 96's financial resources. North View Elementary School was built in 1963-64 with thirty-one classrooms (capacity 1000), Brook View Elementary School in 1967 with sixteen classrooms (capacity 480), and Oak View Elementary School in 1972 with thirty-five open space instructional areas (capacity 1100).

In 1969 the assessed valuation of District 96 was \$117 million. Of this amount \$50 million was residential, \$50 million from one electric power generator, and the remaining \$17 million was from other commercial and industrial properties. The \$50 million in residential represented 5,000 homes valued at \$10,000 each. Each new home was yielding an average 1.3 pupils to the elementary schools. Table one shows the impact of the increase in student enrollment on Valley View District 96's wealth (based on the per pupil Assessed Valuation) during the 1960s.

Table 1

Valley View District 96's Wealth During the 1960s

School year	Assessed Valuation	Pupil Enrollment Beginning of Year	Per-Pupil Assessed Valuation
1960-1961	\$ 63,974,810	900	\$71,083
1961-1962	65,619,359	1,400	46,871
1962-1963	69,495,162	1,875	36,064
1963-1964	87,315,323	2,400	36,381
1964-1965	91,671,252	2,913	31,470
1965-1966	95,064,591	3,321	28,625
1966-1967	97,747,511	3,768	25,941
1967-1968	112,647,949	4,345	25,926
1968-1969	116,715,891	4,904	23,800
1969-1970	117,341,413	5,522	21,250

(Source: Planning a Year-Round School Operation, Final Report, William Rogge, January, 1971)

It is easy to see that with pupil enrollment increasing at a faster rate than the assessed valuation, the per-pupil assessed valuation steadily decreased.

Table two reflects that during the same time period, the combined local tax rate more than tripled. It is important to point out that Illinois taxes are paid on the basis of property valuations for the calendar year prior to the start of the fiscal year. For a district growing at Valley View's rate, this one year delay in receiving tax revenue was a significant hardship.

Table 2

Valley View District 96's Local Tax Rate in the 1960s
Combined Rate in Dollars

Year	per \$100 of Assessed Valuation
1960	\$.7880
1961	.8750
1962	.9720
1963	1.2240
1964	1.6450
1965	2.0680
1966	2.0560
1967	2.3940
1968	2.4230
1969	2.4240

(Source: Planning a Year-Round School Operation, Final Report, William Rogge, January, 1971)

By 1971 District 96 had 5500 students and the Assessed Valuation per pupil had dropped significantly since the construction was mainly residential. The district had dropped from being the fourth in per pupil assessed valuation, in Illinois, to 415th. The major source of revenue was residential property tax. To further impact upon the resources of the district, the state legislature mandated kindergarten in 1970 which represented an additional 1300 students to be housed and taught.

45/15 YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL YEAR

The District 96 Board of Education faced continual enrollment crises coupled with the fact that the district had exhausted the legal limits set by state statute (5 percent of assessed valuation) in raising taxes for the construction of new buildings. In August 1969, they began a

study of the crowded classrooms. The options available to them were sixty to seventy students per classroom, half day sessions, or year-round school year. The first two options were less than satisfactory since the district did not want to sacrifice the quality of the educational program and the community would not be supportive.

In October 1968, the superintendent, one board member, and an assistant superintendent had attended a conference on year-round school operations at Northern Illinois University. There were nearly one hundred attendees with over fifty school districts represented. Many of these school districts were facing similar problems as District 96, but to a lesser degree. Based on the information from the conference, the Board of Education supported the superintendent's recommendation that a full study of year-round school options be undertaken. The goals were to continue to provide a quality education, and at the same time maximize the use of the existing facilities on a twelve-month basis.

The concept of year-round school was not a new one. According to a 1971 report, Rogge states that early experiments with the concept had been tried by Bluffton, Indiana (1904-1915), Newark, New Jersey (1912-1931), Nashville, Tennessee (1927-1932), Aliquippa, Pennsylvania (1928-1938), and Ambridge, Pennsylvania. All of these districts extended the curriculum into the summer with some

semblance of compulsory attendance. However, they utilized only part of the faculty and the physical facilities. Overall costs were increased while improving the quality of educational services. Many of these districts cited shortage of resources and classrooms as major reasons for utilizing some form of year-round school.

Little evaluative data were collected regarding the success of these programs. Rogge, in 1971, reports that there appeared to be five major variables/criteria that defined year-round school plans:

1. Is attendance mandatory during the whole school year except when a pupil is scheduled for vacation?
2. Is the established curriculum available during all periods of the school year?
3. Can students accelerate their attendance so that they will graduate in less time?
4. Does each family have the same vacation pattern?
5. Is the year divided into two, three, or four parts or periods?¹

After the literature and year-round school patterns were reviewed, there were two main questions to be answered.

1. How was community support to be won since so many were new to the community and relatively uninvolved?
2. How could the quarter system of year-round school be modified so that a staggered nine-three (nine weeks in school, three weeks on vacation) plan would have an equal number of days in each quarter, since legal holidays were not evenly distributed throughout the year?²

¹William M. Rogge, Planning a Year-Round School Operation (A Case-Study of the Valley View School District 45-15 Plan) (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1971), 4, Grant No. OEG-0-70-2642 (508).

²William Rogge, "Planning a Year-Round School Operation," 9.

The community support concern was addressed by planning a comprehensive marketing program. It consisted of meetings, coffee hours, spot radio announcements, printed handouts, and slide and tape presentations.

Jim Gove, Assistant Superintendent, and Pat Page, Administrative Assistant, resolved the quarter system question by having the quarters start and stop on any day of the week, whenever forty-five days had passed. The four-quarter systems that had been tried previously by other districts always started the quarter on a Monday and ended it on a Friday, as well as having the students attend for nine months straight and then have three months off. A major complaint of many parents was that they were forced to have three months off in the winter, spring, or fall. Mr. Gove and Mr. Page also planned the 45/15 calendar over a seventeen month period in an effort to ease the explanation to parents and to anticipate any possible longitudinal scheduling problems. The 45/15 plan that they devised was one that assigned students, building facilities, and staff members. Basically, it operated as follows:

One-fourth of the students attended school for forty-five consecutive days. On the sixteenth day, a second group began. On the thirty-first day, a third group entered and attended with the first and second group. On the forty-sixth day, the first group went on vacation, the second and third group continued, and the

fourth group replaced the first group. Fifteen days later, the cycle started all over again.³

A major consideration was the scheduling of children and families. It was decided that neighborhoods would be divided into attendance groups (tracks) by geographical area. In the same 1971 report, Rogge notes that the following conditions had to be met when assigning children to a track:

1. All children from a family [were] to be on the same attendance group.
2. A census unit should respect the sociological dimensions of a neighborhood.
3. Pupils within walking distance of a school should attend that school.
4. Pupils should remain at one school for a year.
5. Class size must vary no more than in previous years.
6. Elective courses at the junior high school must be equally available to all attendance groups.
7. Transportation policy was to remain basically the same for the first year of operation.⁴

In order to meet these conditions volunteers were paid a modest fee to go from house-to-house in order to get the most accurate count of school aged and pre-school aged children. Schedules were then worked out and school boundaries set to achieve the best track balance possible (the same number of pupils on each track). This was no easy task since the elementary school children went into the junior high and the junior high into the high school. There could be children from the same family in all three levels

³William Rogge, "Planning a Year-Round School Operation," 9.

⁴Ibid., 12.

of school, and all of the schools had to achieve the best possible track balance.

After two years of study, planning, and design, the 45/15 plan was implemented on 30 June 1970. There were two options that the district had to consider regarding starting the new plan. They could start the 45/15 Plan gradually or start three groups at once. The decision was to phase the plan in gradually from 30 June to 11 August 1970. The first group gave up the traditional summer vacation and had four three-week vacations during the year. The second and third group had part of their traditional summer vacation and had three-week vacations during the year. The last group didn't start until 1 September 1970. They had a full summer vacation, but didn't complete their academic work until the end of August 1971. This was the only year that the different attendance groups were treated differently. In Rogge's 1971 final report he states that the principals reported a smooth start because of the phasing-in approach.

Ironically, the district began the plan on 30 June, the same day that the state mandated kindergarten programs started. The result was an increase of 1136 students K-12 in 1970-1971 school year. Under a nine-month program the district had space for 5,290 students. There were 5500 enrolled, and an additional 1300 (650 if counted as a half-time equivalent) had to be provided for as a result of the kindergarten mandate. The 45/15 Plan increased classroom

capacity to 7,053 or by 1,763 spaces. The projected enrollment for June 1971, was 6,750 and expected to equal the new 7,053 capacity figure by September 1971. So in essence the year-round plan bought the district a year in postponed construction time.

The district was careful to point out to the community that this solution met an immediate need (continuous population strain). It did not solve all of the problems of the district nor the problems of space in the future. By adopting the 45/15 Plan the district saved more than \$7 million dollars in construction costs (building, equipping, and financing two and a half thirty room elementary schools). The district hoped that there might be more savings if additional costs were managed correctly. For example, careful control of equipment maintenance and replacement, the differential between construction cost increases and interest rates dropping, administrative and maintenance personnel (the number of pupils served is increased without increasing the number of personnel), and reduced need for textbooks and instructional materials (possible increase in wear and tear, but fewer purchased). Table three shows the possible savings for a district where enrollment is increasing and debt retirement is high.

Table 3

Cost Per Pupil savings
1969-1970-1971 on 45/15

	(5,580 students)	(7,440 students)
Administration	\$ 37.27	\$ 31.98
Instruction	512.42	510.75
Health	6.13	6.13
Operation	69.87	67.20
Maintenance	6.11	5.38
Fixed Charges	29.25	29.25
Other w/o Food	8.08	8.06
Transportation	53.12	52.42
Debt Service	87.53	65.65
Capital Outlay	(137.27)	(102.96)
Total	\$809.78	\$776.82

(Source: Planning a Year-Round School Operation, Final Report, William Rogge, January, 1971)

LEGAL

A legal problem for twelve-month schools existed in the school code. There was no language indicating the required number of days in the school year nor the number of hours in the school day. The Seventy-Sixth General Assembly passed House Bill 1525 which Governor Ogilvie signed on 18 August 1969. This bill authorized the Superintendent of Public Instruction to determine the General State Aid apportionment to districts on year-round calendars within the guidelines of Section 18.8 of the Illinois School Code as may be applicable. For 1970-1971 districts on an approved twelve-month calendar would be under the following guidelines as reported by Rogge in his 1971 Final Report on Planning a Year-Round School Operation:

1. General State Aid payments in 1970-1971 will be computed on the following basis:

- a. The best six months' average daily attendance for the 1969-1970 school year.
 - b. The 1968 assessed valuation of the school district.
2. For the 1970-1971 school year, attendance shall be maintained for each tract. In order to compute the average daily attendance for a month, the total days of attendance shall be divided by the number of days school was in session for that month. The average daily attendance for the best six months of the fiscal year will be the initial basis for the 1970-1971 State Aid computation. Inasmuch as approximately 75 percent of the pupils are enrolled at any time, the best six months' average daily attendance will be multiplied by four and divided by three to determine the district's weighted best six months of average daily attendance. The average daily attendance for pupils in grades 9-12 will be multiplied by 1.25 in the State Aid calculation.
3. General State Aid will be distributed to approved school districts in the following manner:
- a. The first General State Aid payment may be vouchered to the State Auditor immediately following the final approval of the Common School Fund appropriation in an amount equal to approximately one-sixth of the district's General State Aid Claim entitlement for 1970-1971.
 - b. Beginning September 1970, payments will be made to approved districts in the same manner as General State Aid payments are made to all districts in the State of Illinois; these payments shall reflect any prior reimbursement.⁵

On 29 June 1970, Governor Ogilvie came to Valley View Community Unit District 365U to sign into law a bill that amended Chapter 122, Paragraphs 10-19.1 and 10-20.12 of the school code to allow for a full school year for one or more schools within a district. This was the day before the district was to begin the 45/15 Plan. In Rogge's 1971 report the legislation was as follows:

⁵Ibid., 72-74.

Any school district may, by resolution of its board, operate one or more schools within the district on a full year school plan approved by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Any board which operates under this Section shall devise a plan so that a student's required attendance in school shall be for a minimum term of 180 days of actual attendance, including not more than four institute days, during a twelve-month period, but shall not exceed 185 days. Under such plan no teacher shall be required to teach more than 185 days. A calendar of 180 days may be established with the approval of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. With this legislation in place the 45/15 Plan was ready to be implemented.⁶

DISTRICT 205 AND THE FORMATION OF DISTRICT 211

During the same time period that the rapid growth was taking place in Romeoville and Bolingbrook, Lockport High School District 205 was experiencing its own problems. The enrollment crises facing District 96 were also impacting on District 205. Classrooms were getting crowded, financial resources were shrinking, and community factions were beginning to form. Lockport and Crest Hill were older communities who were reluctant to raise the educational rate and to raise taxes to build a high school in the Romeoville-Bolingbrook area. There were three referendums in two years. All were strongly supported by the voters in Romeoville and Bolingbrook, but were soundly defeated by Lockport and Crest Hill. This pattern of nonsupport by Lockport and Crest Hill was nothing new. They had successfully blocked all referendums for rate increases for

⁶Ibid., 74.

the previous nine years.

The critics of High School District 205 succeeded in getting a majority representation on the school board in 1969. They proceeded to fire the superintendent, hire a new one whom they felt would solve the district's internal problems, and within the year ended up accepting his resignation. The new Superintendent had little cooperation from the board in trying to meet the objectives that had been set.

As the district's funds grew smaller, it soon became clear that without a rate increase in the educational fund, the district would soon be bankrupt. Teachers were being paid on teacher orders and by August 1970, the district indicated that it would be out of funds by March 1971. The school board president, a former school district critic, urged voters to support the referendum. The response was disbelief by the voters. They challenged the board president since he was the one who had campaigned about how poorly the district was being run, that a referendum was not necessary, and that if he were elected, the problems would be solved. He was labeled as a turncoat and someone who could not be believed. The referendum again failed. The high school teachers' contract also expired during this time, and they were threatening to strike if a satisfactory salary package were not approved. The school board had no alternative but to operate double sessions, cut back

curriculum offerings, limit students to four academic subjects per year, and cut thirty teachers (more than half at Lockport West High School) regardless of the increase in student population. The culminating blow was a letter from Dr. Fisher of the North Central Association putting the high school district on academic warning and giving them a year to remediate the deficiencies.

In 1970 it became clear to the citizens of Romeoville and Bolingbrook that the only way for their children to get a good high school education was to split away from the high school district. The precedent-setting split, the first in Illinois, was initiated by Harold Lindstrom, Vito Martinez and Joe Kovach. With the support of a group in Lockport, who also favored the split, they requested that the board of education schedule a public hearing to hear the petitioners' position regarding the split. A public hearing was scheduled for 7 May 1970. The committee conducted a public meeting prior to the May meeting to explain the proposal and to pass out petitions. By 7 May they needed 66.66 percent of the voters to sign the petition supporting the split.

At the meeting on 7 May the committee presented over five thousand signatures to the District 205 Board of Education. The board was split regarding the issue and voted to refer it to the Will County Board of School Trustees. In June 1970, the county board held a public hearing where supporters of both positions testified. The

county board unanimously voted to approve the split. The opposing faction of parents in Crest Hill and the high school teachers (represented by the American Federation of Teachers), known as Save Our Schools, raised \$2000 to file an appeal. The judge heard the final arguments and upheld the decision of the county board. According to the 25 April 1973 issue of The Beacon, the opponents of the split appealed to a higher court which ruled in their favor, thereby reversing the decision of the county board.

Mr. Kovach, editor of The Beacon newspaper, recruited seven citizens from Romeoville and Bolingbrook to form an "unofficial ad hoc" Board of Education for the new district. This committee proceeded with plans for the new district while he negotiated with the Save Our Schools (SOS) group.

By the end of 1970 an agreement had been reached with the Save Our Schools group whereby the present Crest Hill sophomores could stay at Lockport West High School (the new district high school), without charge, until they graduated. The Save Our Schools group withdrew their court suit opposing the split.

On 12 February 1971, the split became official and Will County Superintendent of Schools, Boyd Bucher, announced that petitions could be filed on 23 February to run for the Board of Education for the new district. The Southwest Graphic, in its 23 February 1971 issue, stated that the seven members of the "ad hoc" Board of Education (fondly

known as "The Magnificent Seven") filed petitions for candidacy. These were Vito Martinez, Harold Lindstrom, Ken Kibler, Todd Lowe, Nelson Eason, Ernesto Edsall, and Tom Eggers. They were overwhelmingly elected in the April election.

On 19 April High School District 211 held its first official meeting and initiated a referendum for building bonds and an educational fund tax increase. This referendum would increase the educational rate from the minimum level to \$1.45 per \$100 assessed evaluation and to issue \$8.2 million dollars in building bonds. The funds would be used to build a new high school in Bolingbrook, to air condition Romeoville High School (it would be the first high school in the United States to begin the 45/15 Plan), and to build a two story addition in the court area at Romeoville High School (to provide space to accommodate the students until the new high school was completed).

FORMATION OF VALLEY VIEW COMMUNITY UNIT DISTRICT 365U

In addition, conversations were being held with District 96 exploring the possibility of forming a unit district and of beginning the 45/15 Plan. The Board of Education sent a letter to the North Central Association regarding the split from District 205 and requested clarification as to whether the new district was under warning as well. They invited Dr. Fisher, of North Central

Association, to visit in order for him to review the curricular offerings and to give them feedback. The end result was that Romeoville High School (formerly Lockport West) was removed from the "warned status" list. A curriculum committee formed with the specific purpose of revising the high school curriculum and scheduling students for the 45/15 Plan.

In October 1971, a referendum was held regarding the formation of a unit district. Both communities supported the concept, and the referendum passed. The goal was to be a unit district by 1 July 1972. The Board of Education formed working committees (high school 45/15, K-12 curriculum articulation, inservice, mechanics of operating a unit district, policy development, negotiations, finances, and transportation) to facilitate the merger. The committees worked throughout the year planning and organizing for the unification. On 20 May 1972, the high school referendum to operate 45/15 passed. On 1 July 1972, Valley View Community Unit District 365U was underway on the 45/15 Plan.

Administratively the Table of Organization for central administration was as follows:

Superintendent: Ken Hermansen (Superintendent of District 96)

Deputy Superintendent: Bill Rutter (Superintendent of District 211)

Assistant Superintendents: Paul Swinford, Joe Coverdill, James Gove, John Lukancic, John Orr.

At the building level there was a principal and an assistant principal for each K-12 school.

By November 1972, the board had revised the Table of Organization so that there were two Deputy Superintendents. Paul Swinford was appointed to the newly created position. In May 1973, Mr. Hermansen was reassigned to Assistant Superintendent, and Mr. Rutter was appointed as interim Superintendent. The Board of Education sat as a committee of the whole for the search of a new superintendent and decided to use the services of the Illinois Association of School Boards superintendency search system. In January 1974, Mr. Rutter was named as superintendent.

POLICY

Since the Board of Education had pledged a philosophy of "act, not react," the establishment of solid policy became a priority. Mr. Vito Martinez, Board of Education President, addressed this need with an article in the fall 1976 issue of the Valley View News. The article, titled "Achieving Accountability Through School Board Leadership or Why An Effective Board of Education Has A Policy Development Process," stressed that policy is the moving force for meeting the expectations of the public. It establishes the guidelines that differentiate the role of the board as

policy makers and the administration as implementors. Since no board of education can operate in isolation, it must involve people, groups, teachers, students, extracurricular parent support groups, and public officials. All of these people have interests in the goals, operation, and results of the district's efforts. In addition to being just policy initiators, they are indeed policy brokers. They mediate conflicting policy recommendations, special interest groups, dissatisfied parents, and make final decisions within the legal constraints of the law. In the end these final decisions are policies which affect the other decisions and actions of lower echelon administrators. Policies set direction, expectations, and enable the administration to manage and operate the schools with consistency and accountability at all levels.

Mr. Martinez summarized very well the reasons why policies contribute to a "soundly organized and efficiently operated school system." He wrote:

Written Policies:

- ...inform everyone of the Board of Education's intent, goals, and aspirations. This reduces ambiguity, confusion, and trouble.

- ...establish a legal record particularly for those which carry force of law.

- ...are impersonal.

- ...foster stability and continuity, especially with transitions of board members and superintendents.

- ...give the public a means to evaluate board performance.

...contribute to the board's efficiency. They free board meeting time so it can be utilized for more important issues and matters.⁷

The policy committee, comprised of board members and Paul Swinford, began in August of 1971 with policies from both District 96 and District 211. After researching firms that specialized in policy development, Mr. Swinford recommended the Croft Educational Service. The format suggested by this group was the most comprehensive and basic and was easy to use with living people behind it. It cost the district \$10,000, and included a monthly publication on a board policy topic as an ongoing inservice tool for the Board of Education.

The task of the policy committee and Croft was to combine the two sets of policies into one, categorize the policies, and make recommendations regarding missing, out of date, and non-functioning policies. Each member of the committee took a section to review and subsequently submitted a report four months later. During the time of this project, Don Davies and Henry M. Brickell separated from Croft Educational Service and started their own company, Davies-Brickell Associates. The new company completed the project.

⁷A. Vito Martinez, "Achieving Accountability through School Board Leadership or Why an Effective Board of Education Has a Policy Development Process," Valley View News, Fall 1976, 1.

On 25 June 1973, the Board of Education formally adopted the revised catalog of Board Policy. An important component of the Policy Manual was the procedure for keeping it current and updated. The Board and Superintendent believed that this was necessary if the document was to be an effective tool and guide for the operation of the district. The Board had a specific mission to accomplish -- to improve the quality and adequacy of education for the children. The events of the past few years, which were the catalyst for the formation of the new district, were still fresh in the minds of the board members. The concern regarding enrollment and meeting the needs of the students was a continuing reminder to the Board of their primary goal -- providing for the educational needs of the children. The Policy Manual contained the following sections: Philosophy, Goals, General Objectives; Community Relations; Administration; Business; Personnel; Students; Instruction; New Construction; Internal Board Policies; Bylaws of the Board. Within each section the policy and the accompanying regulations were numbered and color-coded for easy reference.

In the instructional section was the policy which outlined the philosophy and objectives for the instructional program. Themes that were stressed were individualized instruction; the uniqueness of the individual; instruction based on inquiry, student directed activities, active

learning with manipulative materials where appropriate; accommodation for learning styles; interactive, supportive relationship between teacher and student; team teaching; open-concept; differentiated staffing; and an extended learning environment to include family and community. It also supported teacher inservice and continuous self-evaluation. The goal was as follows:

To create a learning environment within the district based on trust and belief in the learning potential of each person -- a belief that recognizes humans as essentially dynamic beings with a natural desire to learn, succeed, and feel adequate.⁸

The curriculum guidelines were to be general, flexible references for teachers to use, adapt, or adjust so that they were relevant and would meet the needs, capabilities, and interests of the individual child. The same level of performance was not expected of each child, but was to be reflective of the child's capability, needs, and interests.

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

In the area of curriculum and instruction, District 96 was recognized in 1966 by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association as one of 205 school systems nationwide to be selected as demonstration centers. The

⁸"Instruction, Philosophy and Objectives of the Instructional Program of District 365U," 25 June 1973, Board of Education Policy Manual, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, Romeoville, Illinois, 6120(a)-6120(d).

schools selected as demonstration centers served as models and were referred to as the schools of tomorrow. There were three main projects that earned the district this recognition -- creative teaching for gifted children, a multimedia service center, and a non-graded elementary program. Three schools within the district were established as the demonstration centers, one for each of the projects. These centers also served as the inservice center for the project.

During the early 1970s non-graded education, individualized instruction, multimedia instruction, and student directed learning were all popular innovations. During this time dozens of books were being written demanding reform and expressing dissatisfaction with education. Also, states began passing accountability laws to help education become more efficient and effective in the use of tax monies. According to Education Week's issue of 28 October 1987, more than thirty states had passed accountability legislation by 1973. Illinois was no different; in 1973 the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction issued a directive that all districts were to compile Developmental Learning Objectives for educational programs.

District 365U's Board of Education was aggressive in establishing a structure for the curriculum department. Before the unification, both districts conducted ongoing

curriculum work to keep pace with the times. By February 1973, the board adopted specific job descriptions for the Superintendent, curriculum coordinators and principals. According to a 1973 memo on the Process for Curriculum Development, the curriculum development process was as follows:

1. Curriculum coordinator is employed
2. Coordinator assesses current program in district.
3. Coordinator forms K-12 committee of teachers and principals with representation from each building.
4. Coordinator and committee attempt to meet immediate critical needs where gaps in the program exist.
5. Coordinator and committee begin the process of establishing K-12 goals, objectives, and guidelines.
6. Curriculum Steering committee reviews and amends the report of coordinator and committee.
7. Board of Education is requested to adopt the final draft as Official Curriculum Guidelines for the district.
8. Coordinator, Committee, and Principals implement the guidelines throughout the district with in-depth in-service training program.⁹

The curriculum work focused on the following areas:

1. Instructional program
 - a. Process for curriculum work,
 - b. Coordination of principals and curriculum coordinators,
 - c. K-12 health and social studies program,
 - d. Desirability of participation in the Wilco Area Career Center,
 - e. Implementation of math manipulatives in primary classrooms,
 - f. Written process to provide a balanced curriculum at both Romeoville and Bolingbrook High Schools,
 - g. Examination of current high school graduation requirements
 - h. Establish appropriate course requirements which would begin in July 1974,

⁹"Process for Curriculum Development" (Romeoville, Ill.: Valley View Community Unit District 365U, [1973]), dittoed.

- i. Process to determine the effectiveness of current units of instruction at West View Junior High School,
 - j. Establish Reading laboratories at Romeoville High School and West View Junior High School with ongoing program development)
2. Staff development and in-service
 - a. K-12 teacher training program in individualization,
 - b. Identify K-5 teachers in need of help in teaching reading and/or science and provide inservice or individual meetings,
 - c. K-12 music teachers in organization and implementation of the curriculum,
 - d. K-12 in-service program in affective education and human development.¹⁰

Committees comprised of curriculum coordinators, and teachers conducted the curriculum work. In addition a Curriculum Steering Committee comprised of principals and coordinators worked to develop and improve the quality of the district curriculum program by identifying ways to transfer district goals into curriculum and in-service training.

In December 1973, the program plan was presented to the Board of Education for adoption and subsequently submitted to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. When Superintendent Rutter presented the plan to the board, he stressed that one of the goals that society places on education was to prepare children to cope with the rapid growth and change in their lives. In order to meet this

¹⁰ "Instructional, Staff Development, and In-service Goals" (Romeoville, Ill.: Valley View Community Unit District 365U, [1973], dittoed.

goal, careful and systematic planning must take place along with definition of what change and improvement must occur. That plan was the start of the planning process. Continued communication from the community, students, Board of Education and the professional staff were critical strategies to the success of the process. In March 1974, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Michael Bakalis, sent the district a letter approving the plan. It had been reviewed by the State Curriculum Development Section and the School Approval Section. He congratulated the district on taking the first step towards improving instruction.

OPEN SPACE

Another movement gaining popularity in education was open-concept school environments. Since the district's instructional philosophy policy supported open-concept instruction, the Board decided that the new elementary school, Oak View, would be designed around this philosophy. The architectural plan had thirty-five open-space classes with a capacity of 1125. It was designated as the state demonstration model for open-concept education and named as a target school for the Illinois Network of School Development. The projected opening date was July 1972. Dr. William Rogge of University of Illinois was hired as the Educational Leader of Oak View and was assigned the responsibility of opening the school, conducting research

for the district on 45/15, and inservicing parents on open-space education. Dr. Rogge was given the directive to hire staff and to use the 1971-1972 year for planning and inservice. Since the community was growing so rapidly, the year for planning never came to be.

By August 1971, the Oak View teachers and students were housed in the little theater at West View Junior High in Romeoville. As the year progressed, it became necessary to move teams of teachers and students to other schools throughout the district. By the time Oak View opened there were approximately twenty teachers and six hundred students housed throughout every building in the district except Romeoville High School. Accommodation were in gymnasiums, cafeteria areas, and any unused classrooms. Kindergarten operated as a third session in two schools. Those teachers in unused classrooms changed rooms every three weeks depending upon what rooms might be available. Dr. Rogge, as well as the building principal of the host school, supervised and directed the Oak View teachers. Oak View opened in time for the 1972-1973 school year. Within a year's time there were twelve hundred students in approximately 60,000 square feet of open space (emergency maximum was thirteen hundred).

ENROLLMENT

Enrollment continued to be a concern. A study by the Illinois Consulting Service projected that the district would have 28,849 students by 1981. On 26 February 1973, the Board of Education passed a resolution whereby all sixth grade students would attend West View Junior High School and that the school would be on double session for the 1973-1974 school year. According to the Board of Education minutes of 26 February, Superintendent Hermansen presented the resolution because the Bolingbrook schools and West View Junior High were at or in excess of their capacity, and more students were projected. Two of the Romeoville elementary schools would absorb the overflow from Bolingbrook and one would absorb new students from a new subdivision south of 135th Street. With the addition of grade six, the junior high school's projected enrollment for the upcoming school year was 2800 students. The emergency maximum capacity was 1450. It was also stated that this action depended upon the satisfactory passage of the upcoming referendum.

The referendum to be held on 28 April encompassed the following propositions which would provide the needed schools (three junior high schools (6-8) and eight elementary (K-5) for the next seven years:

1. Issue ten million dollars in bonds to construct and equip schools and add to existing ones.
2. Use nine millions dollars in Capital Development Funds (Rent Fund) for the same purpose.
3. Increase the Educational Fund Tax rate \$.35 per \$100 assessed valuation.

4. Increase the Building Fund Tax Rate \$.15 per \$100 assessed valuation.
5. Issue \$923,000 in bond to build two swimming pools, one at each of the high schools.¹¹

If the referendum passed, it was conceivable that one elementary and one junior high would be ready for 1974. The board also pointed out that the bonds would be sold over a number of years. The residents would not pay the entire amount at one time.

Only proposition one passed on 28 April. The board decided to drop the pool proposition, but to have a second referendum on the other three. They campaigned to the community about the necessity of utilizing Capital Development Funds to save money. The buildings constructed would be leased to the district for sixteen and two-thirds years at no interest. Secondly, they stressed that the tax rate increases were necessary to staff and maintain the new buildings. Propositions two, three, and four were passed in July. Bolingbrook residents carried the referendum to passage. Romeoville residents voted to defeat each proposition mainly because the number and percentage of residents with children was dwindling. Romeoville residents also did not want their taxes raised to support schools being built in Bolingbrook.

¹¹"Regular Minutes of the Board of Education Meeting," Board of Education Minutes, 26 February 1973, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, Romeoville, Illinois, 198.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

In the area of student achievement the first formal record available is a report from Fall, 1970 - Fall, 1971 by J. Patrick Page, Administrative Assistant. According to the report, the rapid growth in District 96 resulted in no long-range testing program and no constant, consistent philosophy regarding the purposes for testing. As 45/15 came into existence, a need for a systematic testing program emerged. There would be students attending school according to different calendar; students moving between schools, classrooms, and attendance groups; students moving in with no testing records; the community having an interest in the progress and accomplishments of the district; and the national interest in the successes and/or limitations of the first district-wide, compulsory year-round school system in the United States.

In 1970 District 96 made an oral agreement with Welch Learning Systems to conduct the Fall, 1970, pretest and Fall, 1971, post-test testing program at no cost to the district. Welch was to provide personnel for testing and monitoring, testing materials, scoring and interpretation, and report preparation. In return the district would pay tuition (\$2 per hour) for twenty students with average ability, no learning problems, and low achievement. Utilizing a program modeled after the Westinghouse tutorial

program, Welch would tutor these children. If progress was not adequate, Welch would refund the tuition.

In the fall of 1970 Welch sent its personnel to the schools to conduct the mass testing program. First grade was given just an ability test -- the California Short Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM) -- Level 1, 1964 norms. Grades two through eight were administered the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) -- Form Q. This achievement test covered reading, language, arithmetic, and study skills. The results were to be sent to building principals. Parents who wanted tutoring for their child could request that the results be sent to Welch. This would eliminate the need for Welch to pretest the child prior to starting tutoring. There was a guarantee of one year's academic growth after completing a specific number of hours of instruction.

The fall 1970, first grade ability test results showed that the children were within the average range of ability to do schoolwork. The achievement test results (reported in grade equivalents) for grades two through eight reflected that the children were performing below national norms anywhere from -0.16 to -0.61 with the lag increasing as the children moved up through grades six and seven. The children were identified as underachieving: (1) the first graders had average or better ability and achievement should keep pace, and (2) the vocabulary test was usually higher than the total battery score and the reading score. The

vocabulary test was a predictor since it had been shown to be least related to instruction and training and more related to academic talent and verbal intelligence. Another interesting fact was that there was no differences among the tracks district-wide. To help ensure reliability, all tracks were tested thirty-five days after entering school.

In May 1971, Welch Learning Systems went bankrupt, closed the business, and withdrew all responsibility for the post-testing program for the fall of 1971. The company needed 400 students in order to be profitable, and there had only been eighty enrolled. Since there was no written agreement, the Board had no recourse against the company. They authorized approximately \$6600 to purchase the necessary test materials and scoring services for the fall program. To maintain consistency, the same tests, time guidelines, and procedures were used. The only variable was that classroom teachers administered the tests in smaller groups, and a temporary clerk was hired to mark-sense the booklets and test score sheets.

The 1971 results in first grade ability showed ability to be slightly higher (from +0.6 to +3.8 points). In grades two through eight, arithmetic showed mild to strong gains, language had as many losses as gains, and the trend of achievement dropping behind national norms as the children progress through school was still evident. Comparing first grade to sixth and seventh, there was a lag of a full year.

This was an increase over 1970. A concern was raised as to whether 45/15 was having an adverse effect on intermediate grades. However, other variables such as shifting of classrooms, an unexpected drop in vocabulary scores (indicative of poor test administration), and the movement toward open space instruction had to be considered before making a firm conclusion about 45/15.

According to Rogge in 1971, Mr. Page's recommendations to the Board of Education were as follows:

1. Continue the district-wide testing program
2. Develop a six year testing program with attention to
 - a. Identification of the specific test for each grade level.
 - b. Budgeting the direct cost of the testing program.
 - c. Detailing the general and specific rationale for the testing program.
 - d. Identifying other tests which could supplement the mass testing program.
 - e. Describing the inservice training program for the staff.
3. Conduct a longitudinal study of stratified sampling to ensure sub-groups are represented in the sample in the same proportion that they are in the school population.
4. Test results should remain in the child's cum folder.
5. The superintendent's report should include a summary of right response record and item analysis to identify strengths and weaknesses.
6. Results should be reported in grade equivalents for ease of understanding.
7. Inservice should include review of administration techniques, purpose of the testing program, and uses of the results.
8. Non-English speaking students should be tested in the language in which they are most familiar.

9. Results should be available for parents.¹²

It is interesting to note here that there was not a lot of support in 1971 from the Board of Education nor from administrators for gathering information about student achievement. In his final report on Planning a Year-Round School Operation, Dr. Rogge gathered data about information judged essential to collect on the 45/15 plan via a priority checklist for evaluation. He surveyed the school board (seven members), top administrators (five), and outside experts (fourteen). Of the school board, none believed that collection of student achievement data was essential. Three top administrators and seven of the outside experts, however, believed such collection was essential. In addition the mass testing program was discussed at a round table meeting of principals, assistant principals, consultants, and district administrators. None were in favor of the mass testing program as it was done in 1970 and 1971.

In the fall of 1972, only grades two, four, and six were tested by teachers and counselors with the California Achievement Tests, 1970. Comparison of these results with prior years could be done cautiously since the publisher was the same, the norm population was similar, and the format

¹²J. Patrick Page, "Report of District-Wide Testing Program, Fall 1970-Fall 1971" (Romeoville, Ill.: Valley View Community Unit District 365U, [1971]).

and content were very similar. The results were that second and fourth grades were about the same as before with sixth grade improving about one-fourth of a year. Overall under achievement still existed since the vocabulary scores were higher than all other sub-tests except reading comprehension at grade four.

Joe Coverdill, Assistant Superintendent, surveyed the staff to obtain their opinion on ability and achievement testing. A little over half of the staff supported ability and achievement testing, grades 1-10. Over 80 percent saw testing as useful for individualization, curriculum evaluation, teacher self-assessment, and parent-child use. There was strong support for diagnostic testing to aid in selecting instructional materials and remedial work.

Grades two, four, and six were tested in October 1973, using the same tests as in 1972. In a follow-up study, Dr. Rogge discovered that in 1972 the scoring service used the wrong norm tables and that the results were five to twenty percentile points too low, depending upon the child's performance. Unfortunately, the tests were not saved and could not be rescored. A correction table was made and sent to all principals. In reviewing the data a similar profile existed as in previous years. Second grade data was not available at the time Dr. Rogge wrote the report. Fourth grade was within one-tenth of a year above expected achievement in reading, below two-tenths of a year in

mathematics, and six-tenths of a year below in language. Sixth grade was six-tenths of a year below in reading, nine-tenths of a year below in mathematics, and a year and two-tenths below in language. Since the junior high counselors gave the entire test in one sitting, it was believed that the poor performance in language was partially due to fatigue. The drop in achievement continued to show up in the later grades.

After reviewing the testing summaries from 1970-1972, Dr. Rogge made the following conclusions in a report to Mr. Gove (Assistant Superintendent) in December 1973:

1. Overall achievement drops as the child progresses through school reaching almost a year by junior high.
2. There is no clear evidence that the drop is due to the 45/15 Plan since the drop was present before the Plan was implemented.
3. There is a lot of support from district personnel for "testing" although it is not clearly defined what they want.
4. Future testing should reflect the demands of teachers, principals, consultants, Central Administration, and the School Board.
5. Extensive use of test results will not happen unless decision makers are involved in test selection, creation, and use. In addition extensive inservice training, which must include evaluation and diagnostic testing, must be provided.¹³

Dr. Rogge was ahead of his time with his views on testing and the utilization of the results. In January 1974, he prepared an achievement testing report where he

¹³William Rogge to James Gove, "An Overview of District Testing Since 1970, with Emphasis on District Wide Efforts" (Romeoville, Ill.: Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1973).

summarized the major testing efforts over the past three year period. This included not only the district testing, but the 45/15 Evaluation Project that he was directing.

Highlights of the report are as follows:

1. The students are representative of a cross-section of the United States in academic ability, yet there is a drop in achievement as they progress through the grades.
2. There is no significant difference in performance among attendance tracks, between students living in Romeoville or Bolingbrook, nor between students moving into the district as a group versus students who have spent their academic career in the district.
3. There are significant differences among some of the schools. No strong evidence exists to explain this except initial low academic ability in one school.
4. More useful information about programs would be available if fewer children were tested under more rigorously controlled test conditions and more information were available about the child and his/her environment. Conditions necessary would be giving the child a test appropriate to his/her achievement level, using trained test administrators, and selecting tests that reflect the

objectives of the district and are understood by the child.

5. Inservice training must include the testing program so that the questions from decision makers can be answered and followed up. He suggests using a model from business management so that the needs (which sometimes are conflicting) of the school board, administration, consultants, and teacher can be met and supported.
6. Collection of socioeconomic data is important to help determine how much the expected level of achievement in each school ought to be raised or lowered due to the differences in the school populations. In addition perhaps some explanation of differences among schools could be explained.

During this period from 1970 to 1974, the Board of Education was hearing from parents who were concerned about the education of their children. The parents were upset about the results of the achievement testing, confused and upset about open-space education and a lack of coordination of curriculum throughout the district. Two sets of parents wrote to Dr. Bakalis, Superintendent of Public Instruction of Illinois, applauding his decision to audit the state school districts and requesting that he look at the Valley View District. They expressed their concern about the projected growth of the district, that the reading levels

were below national norms, and that there was a 30 percent increase in taxes. More and more frequently parents were being heard at board meetings and by telephone to central administrators.

In summary, both Bolingbrook and Romeoville experienced tremendous growth of residential housing which put the two districts in a position of providing services with less and less money behind each student. The communities were concerned about the education being provided and the financial problems of District 205. The parents took action to separate from District 205 and formed Valley View High School District 211. Within a year Valley View Community Unit District 365U was formed. To accommodate the increase in enrollment with a shortage of housing, the 45/15 Year-Round School Plan was designed by Pat Page and Jim Gove and implemented. Student achievement was less than the national average, parents were displeased, excuses were being made for the poor performance, and it soon became clear to the board that changes had to be made.

Chapter Three describes the steps that the Board took to meet the concerns of the parents, to reorganize the curriculum and instructional program, and to improve student achievement. The board was determined to act and not let situations and conditions force them to react.

CHAPTER III

VALLEY VIEW DISTRICT 1974-1979

Between 1974 and 1979 Valley View experienced major changes in the direction, organization, management, and mission of the district and of the schools. Up until 1974 the major focus of the Board of Education was to get children off double sessions at the high school and junior high and to provide adequate housing for all students. Hence, 45/15 began for K-8 in 1970 and 9-12 in 1972. Enrollment and housing continued to be a concern even with 45/15 since the district was still growing at a rate of 400 to 500 students a year. Additions had been built on Brook View and Ridge View Schools, and they were still at capacity. All elementary schools in 1974 housed from 900 to 1225 students except for Valley View which had 760. West View Junior High School had 2700 students and was on double sessions in spite of 45/15. Romeoville High School housed 2400 students. New elementary, middle, and high schools were scheduled to open in 1974 to relieve the housing problem. In 1975 there was to be another elementary and middle school completed. The construction of these new

schools was possible by the passage of the referendum in 1973.

Curriculum revision had been initiated by the Superintendent of Public Instruction with the requirement that districts write Developmental Learning Objectives. Steps had been taken in the area of policy to establish a philosophy of instruction, which included an inservice component, and a job description for the curriculum coordinators.

Parents were unhappy with the instructional program, with school boundaries being changed yearly, and with the lack of direction by the Board and Central Administration.

BACKGROUND

The open education philosophy of the early 1970s was endorsed by the district's instructional philosophy policy statement. Each school could choose whatever textbook and instructional materials it desired. The curriculum guides were broad and general to allow for the flexibility of instructional approaches among the schools. There was no monitoring of instruction nor investigation regarding the degree of match between the district's curriculum and the standardized achievement tests. In a report written by Dr. David Pankake and presented to the Board in June 1983, by Superintendent Rutter, the mood of the community in 1974 was summarized as follows:

With the receipt of the sixteen page guidelines for English Language Arts, it became glaringly apparent that continuity between schools within the same district was lacking. All were being run like little kingdoms. The building principals were totally responsible for all that concerned their building, from cracks in the walls to reading levels of students. Some schools were successful, some were not... The final blow came with the results of the district-wide standard achievement test. Our district scored a year below the national average in reading.

Chaos reigned. Pressure groups formed. Parents became afraid that their children were not being exposed to the fundamentals in a district where so much emphasis was placed on innovation...where new ways of doing things consistently dispelled those methods worthwhile in traditional systems....

The need to remedy this situation was screaming at the district from all corners. The School board recognized its responsibility and gave its sanction to an all out effort to right the sinking ship.¹

The same 1983 report by Superintendent Rutter cited that the 13 April 1974 school board election had a record two thousand people voting. Six of the original seven Board of Education members were still seated. Tom Eggers had resigned, and Richard Kavanagh was elected to replace him. Rutter further stated that the cry was for organization and coordination of a comprehensive plan to improve the situation in the district. There were to be three goals: (1) establishing goals and objectives; (2) mandating two or three proven programs and materials to be used in order to achieve the goals; and (3) developing a procedure for evaluation of programs, teachers, and student achievement.

¹David Pankake and John Eckman, "How One School District Sought and Achieved Outstanding Performance from its Schools" (Romeoville, Ill.: Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1983), photocopied.

MANAGEMENT REORGANIZATION

In May 1974, the Board of Education began a search for a new Assistant Superintendent of Instruction. Dr. Orr, the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction at the time, had resigned to become the President of the College of St. Francis.

In the brochure advertising the position of Assistant Superintendent of Instruction, the Division of Instruction was described as follows: The main purpose was the organization of the instructional program. The curriculum personnel were accountable for the development of instructional guidelines for the academic subjects for each developmental level and were to work with teachers in implementation. The division was to provide the organizational framework which allowed for differences in learning and teaching style, assisted the teachers with new materials and ideas, and communicated teacher needs to the board. The assistant superintendent of instruction was to work closely with the curriculum coordinators. In addition the philosophy of learning was restated which reflected the Dewey approach to teaching children.

The qualities listed for the position emphasized a commitment to improving the quality of the instructional program through the principal and teachers, an ability to challenge and inspire principals, to develop a staff .

development program based on teacher and principal needs, to facilitate communications and develop positive human relationships with the community, and to create a plan for continuous evaluation of programs and personnel. This reflected the goals established by the newly elected board.

Paul Swinford, Deputy Superintendent, chaired the search committee comprised of Dr. Blatnik from central office and Mr. Martinez, School Board President. After the committee had screened more than 130 candidates, Mr. Swinford recommended to the Board of Education that Dr. David Pankake be hired to fill the position. At the 22 July 1974, school board meeting, Mr. Swinford reviewed Dr. Pankake's qualifications and quoted Dr. Maurice E. Stapley, Director of Administrative Placement for Indiana University, as follows:

We know of no one in the instruction field who relates better to people, who knows curriculum and instruction better, and whose communication skills are equivalent to his.²

Mr. Swinford also stated that he believed Dr. Pankake's education and leadership experiences would show immediate, positive results for the school district.

By August 1974, the board and Superintendent Rutter acted on the recommendations from Dr. Pankake which would result in significant changes in the instructional program

²"Regular Minutes of the Board of Education Meeting," Board of Education Minutes, 22 July 1974, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, Romeoville, Illinois, 399.

for students. There were six conditions which would guide (direct and control) all efforts at improving the K-12 curriculum program. Superintendent Rutter specified the conditions in a 1983 report to the board:

1. Direction from the Board of Education (policy on school expectations and adequate budgetary allocations).
2. Community and school commitment to the philosophy that students can learn and that learning is important.
3. Centralized curriculum improvement with a district-level administrator in charge, rational procedure for curriculum work, and expected educational outcomes in student learning terms.
4. Provision of resources for instruction in terms of instructional staff, supervisory staff, instructional materials, and evaluation instruments.
5. Management and supervision of instruction by defining the principal's priority job, selecting individuals who understand the priority and are capable of performing it, and establishing an ongoing instructional supervision system.
6. Independent audit of educational achievement done periodically.³

These conditions/recommendations were developed after Dr. Pankake assessed the situation in Valley View. He found that there was no clear-cut board policy as to expectations for the schools nor had there been adequate resources allocated to curriculum development. In the area of curriculum improvement there was a district administrator with line authority over curriculum and instruction; however, in practice only the curriculum staff reported directly to this person. The representatives from the

³David Pankake and John Eckman, "How One District Sought and Achieved Outstanding Performance," 5-6.

schools were involved in specific tasks and for a specified period of time. The principals were basically unsupervised in the operation of the buildings and the implementation of the curriculum. The curriculum staff was responsible for development of curriculum but not for implementation. The curriculum guidelines were developed and written as goals for student learning, but did not address expected outcomes for student learning. As a result there were no district-driven assessment instruments to measure whether the students were learning the curriculum or to measure the effectiveness of the program. There was no specific system of ongoing supervision of instruction and student learning. In addition there had not been an independent audit conducted to assess student learning and program quality.

During the fall semester of 1974-1975, work was underway to write the Developmental Learning Objectives as mandated by the state. The work did not progress smoothly, as Dr. John Eckman, 6-12 Curriculum Coordinator, cited in his final curriculum development report for 1974. The problems existed because of the lack of firm timelines, terminology differences, and leadership conflicts between curriculum coordinators and building principals.

Dr. Pankake organized a training program for the curriculum department and building administrators based on the six recommendations adopted by the board. Project Management became the underlying organizational system for

curriculum development and implementation. The Oregon Tri County Development Project became the model for curriculum work. The four steps in the model were a statement of philosophy, a list of K-12 program goals, the development of a system to organize the course goals (strands or categories), and course goals. In those curricular areas which required further clarity of purpose or where program evaluation procedures were necessary, there were two additional steps: (1) a list of the instructional objectives, and (2) the development of the evaluation process. The instructional objectives served as guidelines for classroom planning and for evaluating student growth. The evaluation process enabled the district to examine the curriculum for possible modification or improvement.

John Hanna, in a bulletin from the Oregon School Study Council in 1974, stated that new organizational patterns needed to be developed to enable bureaucratic organizations to react faster in a rapidly changing technological society. He suggested that project management was rapidly becoming the method that allowed organizations to meet these ever-changing demands. It was a management philosophy that coordinated various sections of the organization to manage activities that involved different levels of the organization. The project was finite, complex, consisted of a series of tasks related only to the project and was a non-repetitive, one-of-a-kind activity. This approach enabled

the organization to satisfy the need for change as well as to maintain the non-changing aspects.

Projects had several phases: conceptual, definition, planning, development, and implementation. The components included a project leader, centralization of planning and control in one person or team, and decentralization of support for the project (i.e., business department assisted in budget development).

Hanna believed that several advantages existed for a school district in using project management: (1) It was a vehicle to respond to problems and change without a permanent structure. Resources could be grouped and regrouped easily. (2) Projects provided an opportunity to train future administrators. The person's degree of knowledge, talent, motivation could be assessed. In addition both the district and the individual could determine whether future working relationships should be considered. (3) This was an excellent opportunity to provide rewards (or in Herzberg's terminology -- "satisfiers") for staff. Examples were recognition, advancement, achievement, work, and additional responsibility. Finally it gave ownership for project quality directly to those who must implement it. There was a greater chance that the change or innovation would be fully implemented over time if those using it were involved in its development.

Ball and Cummings in 1973 suggested combining the project management approach with the implementation manuals that accompany a new instructional program as a means to successfully implement the new program and improve instruction. In doing so careful and thorough planning for the whole implementation process was assured. This included preparation activities, monitoring procedures from start to finish, and transition activities to get the new program ingrained and part of the daily routine.

By January 1975, Dr. Pankake had established a standard procedure for writing curriculum goals, had assigned management responsibility, and was reorganizing the management structure in the schools. The curriculum work directed by the state proceeded in a more orderly manner. In June 1975, the board adopted a "Goals Statement" in support of the project. Each department (Instructional and Program, Administrative, and Support Services such as Building and Grounds, Attendance, Food Services) wrote goals for the 1975-1976 school year. In addition the board adopted a curriculum philosophy policy at the same meeting.

With the new operating procedures implemented, the following changes had taken place: principals were relieved of the operating responsibility for curriculum development, curriculum coordinators were assigned resource and quality control functions, inservice for department chairpersons was provided to explain the new procedures and the new role as

task leaders, terminology was changed from Developmental Learning Objectives to course goals, and timelines were established for all work.

The building principals' training was in the area of project management utilizing a multimedia package and Desmond L. Cook's book titled "Educational Project Management". Discussions were also held regarding their priority job, which was causing students to learn more, and the establishment of an instructional supervisory system. Dr. Pankake also utilized a seminar by Practical Management Associates called "Successful Middle Management" to train principals as managers of instruction. Those principals who did not understand or did not have the capability to achieve the priority job goal were replaced by someone who was capable and ready to move forward.

As he focused on developing the instructional supervision program, Dr. Pankake reorganized the elementary and middle school's administrative structure. The current structure in 1974 was principal, assistant principal, and grade level or department chairpersons. Beginning in 1975 this was modified to principal, administrative aide, and two team leaders (primary and intermediate) at elementary, and one team leader at each of the middle schools. This new structure was phased in over a period of two years. The principal's role was as the instructional leader or manager of instruction. The administrative aide was a non-certified

person in charge of all non-instructional operations of the school (custodial, lunchroom, building and grounds, after-hours building usage, office management, budget and book-keeping, lunchroom and playground aides, field trips, assemblies, schedules for released planning periods for teachers, etc.). The team leader position was not an administrative one. The person in this role was considered a "master teacher" and was released half a day to supervise instruction in either K-2 or 3-5.

The philosophy behind the team leader as instructional supervisor was that as a member of the teaching staff the person would be less intimidating to teachers than would an administrator. There would be more of a collegial, collaborative relationship with the focus being the improvement of instruction so that children learned more. With this organizational revision, the primary job of the principal and team leaders was to improve instruction and student achievement. In management terms, the principal was the manager and the team leaders were the technical experts and supervisors.

As team leaders were hired, they attended a Practical Management Associates seminar on "The Job of Supervision". Dr. Pankake also conducted monthly training sessions where the team leaders shared the techniques that were being used to solve instructional problems, and discussed the book, Learning from Teaching by Jere Brophy and Carolyn M.

Evertson, to identify twenty instructional behaviors that were positively correlated with student achievement. The twenty behaviors became one of the focal points in assessing instructional effectiveness in the classroom and served as a point of conversation between the team leader and the teachers. The other topic of discussion was training in project management.

Part of the district level instructional management program was the quarterly reviews with the building principal, team leaders, Dr. Pankake, and the respective curriculum coordinator. At these meetings student achievement on the district curriculum areas of reading, language arts, math, science, social studies, and health was reviewed.

At the August meetings building grade level and teacher instructional goals, district and standardized achievement test performance goals, and project plans to achieve these goals were presented to Dr. Pankake and the Curriculum Coordinator for review. The October, January, and March meetings reviewed progress toward these goals. In addition to reviewing the mean scores on the district assessment tools, the reports included the percentage of students performing at or above 80 percent of the answers correct by class and by grade. These data enabled the principal and team leader to identify whether or not the majority of the students were mastering the curriculum. The June meeting

was a summation of the year's progress on both district and standardized measures.

Analysis of standardized achievement test results was received in July. In addition to receiving the mean percentile scored by grade and class, the principals received an item analysis report for the objectives on each subtest. Identified was the percent of students in the class, grade level, and district which scored correctly. The percent of students nationwide who answered correctly was reported as well. Since there was an analysis of how the curriculum matched the standardized achievement test, the principal, team leader, and teachers could identify which district instructional objectives had been taught well and which ones needed improvement. Some guidelines in identifying learning objectives which needed improvement were as follows:

1. Did the grade/class score below the nation or district on the objective?
2. Is the objective part of our guidelines for this grade level?
3. Did the grade or district score between 30 and 70 percent correct?
4. Of the errors made, was there a common error?
5. Is it an objective on which we believe that we can do better?⁴

This set the basis for supervision and instructional improvement dialogues between the team leader and the teachers. Yearly instructional targets were set based on

⁴"Test Data Used to Increase Student Learning," Valley View News, Fall 1978, 1.

this information and a determination made regarding how instructional materials, methods, and assessment tools would be used to reach the instructional target. The end result of the supervisory practices of the team leaders was that teachers taught the district curriculum with care and thoroughness, and that they paid close attention to whether students were learning.

In the 15 January 1986, issue of Education Week, Matthew B. Miles, senior research associate at the Center for Policy Research and a researcher on effective-schools programs, stated that one "Achilles heel" of effective-schools programs was difficulty with focusing on instruction. In 1983 he found less than one-third of thirty projects surveyed were linked directly with changing or improving school curricula. Without the tie to instruction, the chances of an enduring impact were small. In the same issue Helen E. Efthim, research associate for the Pontiac, Michigan, school district, said that focus on curriculum and instruction was the difference between success and failure. The Education Commission of the States found that successful school improvement programs focused on the core educational issues of teaching, learning, and instruction within two or three years.

CURRICULUM

The foundation of the whole instructional management system was the curriculum itself. The first curricular area to go through the three-phase curriculum cycle of assessment, development, and implementation, was mathematics. This area was selected because its finite nature would show quicker results. The curriculum development committee was comprised of the math curriculum coordinator, a primary (K-2), an intermediate (3-5) and a middle school (6-8) teacher. To get a program in place as quickly as possible, the Fountain Valley Continuum of Skills was adopted. In the spring of 1976, Dr. Henry M. Brickell of Policy Studies in Education assisted the team in further developing the curriculum objectives through a task analysis and priority skill approach. Once the curricular sequence for K-8 was established, criterion referenced objective and semester tests, and a record keeping system were developed. A final step was to assess the degree of match between the district math curriculum and the standardized achievement test. The best match for the initial set of objectives was 30 percent, and that test was selected for May 1976, testing. During the summer curriculum work, the consensus was to shrink the math curriculum to match the tests currently available rather than expand the tests by writing additional items ourselves. The mathematics subtest of the

stanford Achievement test was subsequently selected to test the revised curriculum.

Since this was the first effort at extensive curriculum work under the Oregon Tri County model, the project lasted four years instead of three. An evaluation and modification year was added since feedback on the objectives, objective and semester tests, and the record keeping system was obtained. Reading and language arts was the next academic area to start through the new curriculum development program. A five-year curriculum cycle time frame was developed for all of the major academic areas as well as art, music, physical education, health, science, social studies, ROTC, multi-talented (gifted), library/media center, English as a second language, bilingual, drivers education, foreign language, guidance/counseling, industrial arts, and business education. Any special activities such as report card format, multi-tracked classes (45/15), graduation requirement, etc., were also organized and conducted in project management format. This enabled the district to address special needs with maximum efficiency, minimum cost, and involvement or representation of all relevant personnel. By June 1975, a process for identifying and selecting projects in curriculum and instruction had been developed by Dr. Annette Moore and Dr. John Eckman, Curriculum Coordinators. The two curriculum coordinators

made quarterly reports to the board regarding the progress being made on the various projects.

In April 1978, the board adopted the middle school as the organizational plan for grades six, seven, and eight. The sixth grade would be organized as self-contained classrooms with one teacher teaching all subjects. The students would leave the classroom only for the electives and for physical education. If learning needs warranted it, teaming or modified departmentalization could be utilized. Grade seven would be semi-departmentalized with students moving between two teachers and leaving for electives and physical education. Grade eight would be departmentalized or modified departmentalized depending upon the needs of students. If necessary, self-contained classrooms could be organized for some students. The plan was adopted to help the adolescent age students adjust gradually to the self-responsibility and independence required at the high school level. The plan was phased in over three years. Experience and assessment indicated that the flexibility of the first-phase implementation was important to retain, so flexibility in organizational patterns was retained. The preferred composition of the teaching staff was holders of K-9 certificates or 6-12 certified personnel who were willing to teach at least two academic subjects. An effort was made to transfer to the high school those teachers who were single-subject oriented.

In March 1979, the high school curricular offerings had been reviewed with input from principals and the high school teachers. As a result the new high school offerings were divided into three areas -- college-bound, career-oriented, and general high school. In grade eight, counselors and parents would assist the students in selecting the proper course of study. By reorganizing the program in this manner, Dr. Eckman, 6-12 Curriculum Coordinator, believed that the needs of the students would be better met.

In the summer of 1977 Superintendent Rutter wrote a message to the taxpayers of the district where he reflected upon changes that had taken place over the past two or three years. The purpose was to reaffirm the degree of commitment to the educational program of the district. In this newsletter he wrote that proper planning was the best solution to resolving the educational problems. One of the major efforts had been the development of a well thought-out curricular structure which was implemented in all of the schools. The five-year curriculum cycle had been effective and would be continued. In addition to those projects on cycle, there were twenty other individual curriculum projects undertaken as well as providing inservice for the teachers in each project.

The basic skill thrust would continue with a special emphasis at the middle secondary school level. The district-wide testing program would continue. Great

progress had been seen, and the data would continue to be used to upgrade and identify weak instructional areas. The goal was constant improvement each year in reading, language arts, and mathematics.

There was a standard textbook policy to ensure that there would be a continuous sequence of textbook materials to provide a continuum from one grade to another. These textbooks were coordinated with the curriculum and goals to provide equal quality of materials.

Career education was a priority, and an awareness program had been implemented for grades kindergarten through fifth. For the middle school career exploration was developed, and the senior high had a multifaceted program. Included at the secondary level was a Work-Study Program, participation in the Wilco Career Center, and high school vocational preparations programs.

According to the board, the district had developed a sound fiscal management system to fund this work. The tight financial control over the past four years had resulted in a sound financial structure from which the educational program could operate. The pursuit of prudent spending to yield maximum dollars for education would continue along with the fine curricular programming.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

The results of the fall 1973, grade two standardized achievement tests had not changed significantly from 1972. Using the vocabulary subtest results as an indicator of potential and comparing it with the other achievement subtests, the second graders in Bolingbrook were at or above expectancy in all areas except listening (six months below expectancy). The Romeoville students were mainly at expectancy except for listening which was eight months below. As in earlier years there was no significant difference among tracks district-wide nor between new students and the current ones. Overall there was a slight improvement over 1972 results with mathematics and reading better than language.

Dr. Rogge, Director of Research and Testing, recommended that a good test of general academic ability be administered to grade two or three to get a better baseline for the district and to assist in setting performance expectations. The last indicators were in 1970 and 1971. The purpose of this department was to develop recommendations for a testing program, review available tests, score and summarize the testing program, assess and report on the effectiveness of the 45/15 Plan, gather data on potential drop-outs, write research proposals, and explore an experimental screening test for learning disabilities.

In January 1975, Dr. Rogge prepared a memorandum to Dr. Pankake which summarized the history of the testing program through 1973 and gave recommendations for 1974-1980. The earlier recommendations were as follows:

1. Use the Cooperative Educational Test and Sequential Tests of Educational Progress. There is a better relationship with district objectives, the elementary series is hand-scored, the norming procedures are the best available, and there are higher level thinking skills question as well as factual for science, social studies, and mathematical concepts.
2. Testing should be done in the spring to gather instructional feedback on the year's instruction for teacher and building use.
3. Continue to use the test for monitoring achievement as a whole, but also for general evaluation in order to make decisions in three areas. These are program development, individualizing instruction for specific students, and improvement of the teacher's professional behavior (teaching methods).
4. Decide on a common usage of evaluation in the district. After summarizing the results of all administrators and consultants views based on the CIRCE scale, it was evident that some see it for teaching purposes and other for program evaluation and monitoring.⁵

His recommendations for 1974-1980 were as follows:

1. Test all students by May of each year in grades one and three with the COOP, grades five and eight with the STEP and SCAT (ability test), and grade eleven with the STEP. Report results in national and local percentiles, standard scores, and, if appropriate, grade equivalents.
 - a. The top 5 to 10 percent in grades five and eight could be given the next higher level of the test since the norms don't allow these children to get full credit for what they know. The ceiling is too low.

⁵William Rogge to David Pankake, 24 January 1975, "Recommendations for Testing and Evaluation for Valley View District for Period 1974-1980," draft memorandum.

2. Test a stratified random sample of grades four, seven, and eleven in the fall 1975, to evaluate the 45/15 Plan. A suggested sample is as follows:
 - a. Elementary: 168 children representing each school and both sexes; one, two, and three or more years of residence in the district; and all four quartiles of ability.
 - b. Junior high school: forty-eight students representing the same breakdown.
 - c. Senior high school: forty-eight students representing the same breakdown.
3. Provide testing materials, scoring and consultation to any school with a specific purpose in mind. Always share testing results with parents. Individual school testing approval must be clear cut, and blanket testing of whole grades discouraged.
4. Provide consulting services to principals, coordinators, and consultants to do any program evaluation.
5. Incorporate teacher feedback into inservice programs with a climate of support and models of new behavior.⁶

In 1974-1975 standardized achievement tests were administered to grades five, eight, and eleven. The grade equivalent scores reflected gains over the previous year; however, they were still below the national average. An aptitude test was administered, and the results showed a range of ability from the sixteenth percentile to the fifty-second percentile. The majority of the schools were clustered between the sixteenth and the thirty-first percentile. Only one school was at the national average. Dr. Rogge's position was that gains could be made in the mathematics area. But since the aptitude was below the

⁶William Rogge to David Pankake, 24 January 1975, "Recommendations for Testing and Evaluation for Valley View District for Period 1974-1980," draft memorandum.

national average, it was doubtful that gains would be seen in language.

An article in The Beacon newspaper on 13 August 1975, supported the contention that students could not be expected to achieve the national average because the low aptitude was due to home and environmental factors. Dr. Rogge stated in the same article that the low aptitude was a function of the culture. Dr. Pankake, however, related some actions that had been taken to improve student performance in subsequent years. He alluded to performance expectations, goals and objectives established and written in student performance outcomes, and the revisions in mathematics, reading, and language arts. His expectations were for a 10 percent increase in language scores during the next year.

The achievement test results, reported in the article, stimulated responses from parents who were naturally concerned about some of the statements and from the teachers' union. At the board meeting when the results were presented, a parent called the situation a crisis and considered it an outrage that the parents were being blamed for the performance of the children. He placed the burden back on the board since they were the ones with the authority to initiate programs and correct the situation. In addition he reminded them of their pledges and promises made at election and bond referendum times.

The teachers' union president, Ray Kaufman, reminded the board that the staff of the district reflected the type of leadership shown by the administration and the board.

Dr. Pankake reiterated some of the work already in place to improve the scores. One of the key components being developed was the district testing of skills at the individual schools throughout the year. This would tell the teachers when a child was doing well and when s/he wasn't.

In a letter to the editor in The Beacon on 27 August 1975, Richard Kavanagh, Secretary of the Board, outlined some of the accomplishments that had taken place. These were an integrated, coordinated curriculum in language arts and math, textbooks for the middle schools to replace the teacher "units", room partitions ("walls") for Oak View School, a formalized evaluation system for administration and staff, a formal evaluation program for Vocational Education Programs, and three new schools opened with three more under construction. In addition a formalized procedure for the identification, analysis, and resolution of operational problems within the district called "Project Management" had been implemented. This allowed greater control and flexibility in dealing with these problems as well as resolution of problem quicker and more efficiently.

In the same edition of The Beacon, Todd Lowe, board member, stressed the fact that the board was concerned about the performance of the students. He believed that under the

guidance of Dr. Pankake, improved curriculum programs would reflect significant progress on achievement tests. He also stated that some schools showed improvement because they utilized practice tests prior to taking the standardized test to familiarize the students with format, or tested all grade levels yearly. The goal of the board was to utilize the results to measure the effectiveness of the curriculum programs. The legitimate means to improve scores was to improve curriculum programs on an ongoing basis, to use teacher evaluations and inservice on effectiveness training, and to continue to analyze strengths and weaknesses and focus on problem areas.

In February 1976, the board entered into a contract with Dr. Brickell and Policy Studies in Education whereby he would conduct the standardized testing program for the 1975-1976 school year. The contract contained the following approaches:

1. Analyze and select additional nationally standardized achievement tests to fit the new mathematics curriculum. These are to be used in addition to the ones already in place.
2. Administer a full battery of standardized ability and achievement tests in grades one through eleven during May. Ability testing to be administered to grades one, three, five, eight, and eleven. Included will be a measure of family socioeconomic background.
3. Have teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, and parents identify specifically what each is doing to improve learning.

4. Interpret test results to get ideas for improving the curriculum content, the program structure, and what all groups can do to help students learn.⁷

The results of the Spring 1976, testing program showed an overall improvement in all grade levels except for grade eleven in reading and language arts. Ability testing demonstrated that in grade three the students had ability above the fiftieth percentile, but grades five, eight, and eleven were in the upper thirties on the SCAT and the upper forties on the Otis Lennon. Accordingly performance in grades one and two was above the fiftieth percentile and progressively dropped in the upper grades to the twenties and thirties by grade eleven. The phenomena of declining achievement as students progressed in school was still evident.

Dr. Brickell prepared a special report in September 1976 on Student Achievement and Adult Teaching Behaviors, 1975-1976. The results from the principals, teachers, instructional aides, and parents revealed which behaviors associated with learning were being used on a consistent basis. From principals positive behaviors included leadership, direction, clarity, concern for tested student learning, and singling out good teaching activities for praise. Teachers indicated that students needed to be told

⁷Henry M. Brickell to David Pankake, "Excerpts from MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT between Valley View Public Schools and Policy Studies in Education concerning 1975-1976 Testing Program," 7 February 1976, exhibit 1.

exactly what is expected, how well they are doing, must be asked to do more than recall facts, asked to help other students, and have teachers respond to their feelings. In addition, small group or one to one teaching was best in both language and math instruction.

Instructional aides worked in small groups and one to one. Certain techniques such as direct teaching and testing behaviors were more closely related to student achievement than personal interest, affection, and praise. They needed to focus directly on learning and be friendly, but businesslike with students. Parents of grades one and two used good behaviors more frequently than parents of fourth and fifth graders. Examples were adding to the child's experience by introducing something new to him/her, playing games that called for sustained concentration in order to complete them, examining and discussing papers brought home from school, and asking questions to test the child's understanding of what has been studied. It was important for parents of all grades to tell the children what was expected to be accomplished in school, take a direct interest in what was being learned, teach or help them when appropriate, and encourage them to get special help from the teacher when needed.

All of the items on the questionnaire were from research literature and were found to have positive correlations to student learning. It was important at this

time to convince all of the groups that the children were capable of learning and that they helped make it happen. It was believed that by raising the level of awareness of all groups about the effectiveness of what they were already doing, the test results would improve.

Attitude was critical to improvement. To accomplish this goal, the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC), an individual intelligence test, was administered to a random sample of students in 1976-1977. If the scores on the Otis-Lennon and on the WISC were similar, there would be added confidence in the results of the group test. The results confirmed the contention that Valley View students had average ability to do school work and could be expected to do so.

The spring 1977, standardized testing results reflected improvement in student achievement up through grade seven, but no significant changes in grades eight and eleven. In a July 1977, report to Superintendent Rutter and Deputy Superintendent Swinford, Dr. Pankake summarized the results as follows:

1. Ability was assessed at grades one, three, five, eight, and eleven. In addition to group ability testing, a random sampling of students was completed using the WISC. All tests indicate that the overall ability of Valley View students was average and that average achievement could be expected.
2. All scores at all grade levels in math for grades one through seven were at or above the national average (fiftieth percentile). For grades three through seven the range of increase was from two percentile points to eighteen with the majority being twelve to fourteen.

3. Performance in language arts for grades one through five showed growth over the past two years. Reading was at or above the national norm for these grades. Although gains were seen in the "mechanics of English", it was an area which would be targeted for improvement.
4. At grade nine the efforts to improve performance in the mechanics of English were working. There was an average gain of six points by the ninth graders over their own performance as eighth graders. The ninth grade writing program was modified for use in the middle schools and was scheduled for use in 1977-1978.⁸

Dr. Pankake pointed out that behind every percentile reported, there was an average of one thousand students. So changing the mean score was no easy task. A change of three points or less was no change. A change of more than three points was statistically significant. Any change of more than six points meant that the odds of it being an accident are one in one hundred. Therefore, substantial growth was being made in math and, most importantly, at no cost to the district's performance in reading. Continued improvement was expected.

The results of the 1977-1978 standardized testing program showed significant improvement in student learning through grade eight. These scores began to dispel the trend where achievement declined as students progressed through the upper grades. Due to the curriculum work in Language Arts and the implementation efforts in 1977-1978, English mechanics grades in grades four through eight were showing

⁸David Pankake to William Rutter and Paul Swinford, "Spring '77 Test Results," 29 July 1977, memorandum.

gains of five to fifteen points. Mathematics was showing greater gains in computation than in concepts and applications. During this school year modifications in the math curriculum included those objectives considered to be basic, primary concepts and skills in order to get a better match on the standardized tests. As a result the Stanford Achievement Test was selected to be the sole math test. The CPT and STEP were used for reading and English.

Dr. Brickell reported to the board that in his thirty-some years in education, Valley View had shown the greatest improvement. He also prepared two additional reports from the 1977-1978 testing results. One was an analysis of the change from 1976-1977 to 1977-1978 in grades one, three, five, eight and eleven with the scores corrected for the changes in ability. Again significant gains were demonstrated in reading and English with moderate gains in math. The second report compared the district to the nation in reading and English based on the percent of students answering the questions correctly. Grade six had an improvement of 18 percent in 1977-1978 while the other grades were relatively stable. Punctuation and capitalization in grades four through eight had an average improvement of 4 percent.

The 1978-1979 basic skills test results were the highest to date in Valley View's history. Dr. Brickell's summary reported that in English for the first time, grades

1-6 were above the national average (fiftieth percentile) on every subtest. Grades 1-4 ranged from the fifty-fifth to eightieth percentiles. Grades 7-11 were still below the national average, but they improved on fourteen out of twenty-five English subtests.

In math grades 1-7 the students scored at or above the sixtieth percentile with grade 8 four or five points behind. Grades one and two were at the seventy-seventh and seventy-eighth percentiles. These scores reflected an average increase of seventeen to eighteen percentile points in three years. Grades nine, ten, and eleven were within three to five points of the national average.

On the ability test, grades one, three, five, and eight showed increases of four to twelve points over the three year period. This demonstrated to the teachers, administrators, and parents that the more English and mathematics that the students learned, the more they would be capable of learning in the future. In reviewing the ability tests at grades five and eight, it was evident that they were very similar to achievement tests.

The 1979-1980 report from Dr. Brickell was again very positive. For the fifth year in a row, students test scores were higher than they had ever been in Valley View history in grades one through ten in both math and English. In English grades one through six were all above the national average with grades one through four scoring from the

sixtieth to the eightieth percentiles. Although grades seven through ten were still below the national average, they improved almost twice as much as those students in grades one through six. This was a first in Valley View history as well.

In math every grade from one through ten scored above the national average. Of the thirty-three subtests taken in these grades, twenty-nine of them were at the sixtieth percentile. Grades one through five were scoring between the sixty-fifth and almost the ninetieth percentile.

Further analysis reflected that every school in the district was improving in English and math. The ability of the students continued on the upward trend as well. Again showing that they were capable of learning even more.

ENROLLMENT AND 45/15

Housing continued to be a cause for concern in spite of 45/15. In September 1974, Superintendent Rutter addressed the matter to the board in an Action Report on housing for the 1975-1976 school year. The current enrollment increases as well as the projected ones for next year indicated that overcrowding would exist at Oak View Elementary and B.J. Ward Middle School. Elementary enrollment had increased by 314 students in 1973-1974 and middle school by 221. In developing possible solutions there were several factors that had to be met: (1) there would be no double sessions;

(2) the amount of instructional "interference" in the K-12 instructional program had to be minimal; (3) transportation costs had to be kept to a minimum; and (4) there could be no lease purchase of additional space. The decision for the Oak View situation was to transfer three special education classes to a church where space was currently being leased for attendance/enrollment, and reassign K-5 Romeoville and Bolingbrook students to Valley View Elementary School. To resolve the B.J. Ward situation, all grade eight students would attend Romeoville and Bolingbrook High Schools. The grade six and seven students would be split between the two middle schools, with future overflow going to West View in Romeoville. This would relieve the crowding until the third middle school could be opened in 1976-1977.

In December 1974, Superintendent Rutter presented an addendum to the September recommendations that specified which housing areas would attend West View. The recommended housing areas were ones close to major thoroughfares which would simplify transportation routes. The students were currently being bused, they represented growth areas, they were all west of Route 53, and all would attend the new middle school when it opened.

In the spring of 1974, Dr. Rogge, Director of the Department of Research and Testing, conducted an assessment regarding teacher, student, and community response to 45/15 and an overview of the impact on standardized achievement

tests. The elementary teachers were the most supportive of the year-round program. They and the middle school teachers responses had changed very little in the four years that the plan had been in operation. At the middle school and high school level the men were more negative than the women. It was interesting to note that approximately 10 to 20 percent of the faculty were hostile to the 45/15 Plan, however, they tended to be negative towards everything in general. About 30 to 40 percent of the faculty was totally supportive. Concerns expressed were regarding class size, parent support, fatigue, and student achievement. The high school report reflected the following areas of concern which warranted further investigation: student reaction, planning difficulties, work load, teaching difficulties, teacher fatigue, and variation in class size.

The community response as to the worth of the 45/15 Plan was average to good, not significantly different from four years ago. The community did prefer the 45/15 Plan over double sessions. The biggest concern remained the supervision of students during their winter vacations when the mother was working. About 10 percent of the respondents were hostile not only to 45/15 but to everything in general.

Students reactions were more positive at the elementary and middle school level than at the high school. In terms of their test scores, no solid trend seemed evident either up or down. There were some fluctuations by schools which

were short-lived, and the pattern of a drop below national norms as students progress through the grades still was present.

By August 1975, an increase of 564 elementary, 132 middle school, and 313 high school students had enrolled. The district had experienced enrollment growth every year since 1967. In August, Superintendent Rutter sent a letter to all parents in the district regarding the housing problem at the high school level. The district had experienced a slight relief in 1974-1975 with 376 fewer occupancy certificates than the previous year. The upcoming year would experience over 1000 occupancy certificates issued, and then the next two years would drop off to between 692 and 720. The proposed plan was to change the high school attendance boundaries so that more students would be attending Romeoville High School which was below capacity.

The district continued to grow during 1975-1976, but an interesting phenomena happened in 1976-1977. The elementary grades grew by 320 students, while the middle school and the senior high school grew by only ninety-two and eighty-eight respectively. This was a significant drop for both levels. 1977-1978 saw the elementary grow by 147, the middle school by seventy-three, and the senior high by 111. 1978-1979 showed the first decline in student enrollment in the history of the district. The elementary enrollment dropped 185 students, the middle school dropped 113, and the senior

high continued increasing by forty-six students. The senior high school increased its enrollment by 119 students in 1979-1980 while the elementary lost 321 students and the middle school lost sixty-nine. The net result for the district was a loss of 213 students in 1978-1979 and 250 in 1979-1980. This began a trend of declining enrollment that has continued up to the present time.

With the opening of two more elementary, two more middle schools, and the declining enrollment, the board began consideration of returning to a traditional school year. On 30 October and 1 November 1979, two public hearings were held to gather input from the public. In the Fall 1979 community informational bulletin, the board was very clear in pointing out that the responsibility for student housing rested with the board. The decision, however, affected the entire school district. A volunteer Citizens Committee had been studying the question and had reported to the board. The board wanted opinions from the community as a whole before making a final decision.

The facts presented to the community were that kindergarten enrollment had dropped 304 students in four years, K-12 enrollment had dropped 463 students, and that the year-to-year survival rate (enrollment by grade on a year-to-year comparison) had declined for the past two years. The housing problem was multifaceted. First, there continued to be a space problem at Bolingbrook High School

where enrollment continued to increase, while Romeoville High School was experiencing a decline. This presented the second problem, the quality of education at Romeoville High School. It was very difficult to provide a comprehensive quality high school program with decreasing enrollment particularly in a school on a year-round program. Next, with the opening of the new schools at the elementary and middle school levels and the projected numbers not materializing, there was sufficient space to house the students on a nine-month program. Last, the energy costs and inflation were such that the buildings needed to be managed and used in the most cost efficient manner. It is interesting to note that the same circumstances that brought about the 45/15 Plan (space, the need for new buildings, and financial concerns) were to be the same ones to bring about a consideration to return to nine-month program.

The board presented a few proposed solutions to the community. These were:

1. High school boundaries remain the same.
2. Romeoville High School would be on a nine-month plan in an effort to increase the number of students in attendance at one time and to maintain the quality and scope of the educational offerings. Bolingbrook High School would remain on 45/15. Students would have the option of attending Romeoville High School if they preferred to attend on a nine-month schedule. This would relieve some of the housing pressure on Bolingbrook High School.
3. Nine-month school year for all elementary and middle schools.
4. Nine-month school year for all elementary and middle schools whose students feed into Romeoville High School.

5. Enrollment of all new high school students at Romeoville High School.⁹

At the 26 November 1979, board meeting Superintendent Rutter read a statement regarding the actions under consideration by the board. In it he stressed the board's commitment to community participation prior to making the decision about how to resolve the housing problems at this time. In addressing the issue of space, there were many tools utilized such as split shifts, double sessions, large classes, and 45/15. He indicated that 45/15 was a specialized tool which met a need at the time, but it was not a religion. The needed space was available, and 45/15 had served its purpose.

Economically the benefits of the traditional school year had to be addressed since housing had caught up with enrollment. To overcome rising costs while maintaining educational quality, reduced energy costs, cash flow management, and maximum staff utilization were necessary. A high school with 1800 students was more educationally advantageous than four schools with 450 students each since more class offerings could be available.

Community needs were an important consideration as well as student needs. To ignore them would cause divisiveness

⁹"Student Housing, Community Information Bulletin" (Romeoville, Ill.: Valley View Community Unit District 365U, [1979]).

that would be detrimental to everyone. The main goal had to remain the provision of quality education for young people.

At the 26 November meeting, the board voted to return to the traditional school year with the beginning of the 1980-1981 school year and changed the high school boundaries so that there would be sufficient space at Bolingbrook High School. In the Winter 1979 newsletter, Superintendent Rutter reported to the community regarding the decision of the board. The main thrust was that the quality of education would be upgraded for the following reasons:

1. Teachers would remain with students for the entire school year.
2. All multi-track and dual track classes would be eliminated which would result in full continuity of instruction.
3. Class size imbalances due to tracking would be eliminated. Class sizes would be more equitable.
4. There would be added opportunities for teacher in-service programs and better planning for program improvement.
5. Summer school enrichment and remediation opportunities would be available on a tuition basis.
6. Estimates showed a possible savings of approximately \$2 million dollars as a result of the traditional year. Of this \$200,000 would be in energy costs, \$1.4 million in staffing and personnel, \$100,000 in cash flow management, and \$250,000 in operation cost reductions.¹⁰

The balance of the newsletter presented various types of questions which had been received and provided answers. Anyone with questions was encouraged to speak with the building principals who would provide or obtain the answers.

¹⁰"School Program Change Adopted," Valley View News, Winter 1979, 1.

POLICY

The major focus in the area of policy was on aligning the curriculum, the testing program, the management structure, and community commitment and support. On 22 July 1974, the board adopted a set of procedures on the adoption and amendment of policies. Since the policies are the backbone and guidance system for the operation of the district, they must remain dynamic and reflect the needs and philosophy of the times. The procedures set a timeframe of review and appraisal as well as the procedures for change.

At the 10 March 1975, meeting the board revised the Bylaws regarding Board Committees. Up to this time there were standing committees such as curriculum, policy, finance, transportation. The board in 1975 wanted the opportunity to utilize the expertise of community members, increase citizen participation, and to address current issues without having permanent committees. They therefore abolished standing committees, but committed themselves as the need arose to forming special committees which would have specific objectives and timelines. Upon the conclusion of the project, the committee would be dissolved. This action replaced the bylaws which were initially adopted in 1973. Later in May the board established liaison representatives to the Village of Bolingbrook, Village of Romeoville, Will County Vocational Education Cooperative, IASB/IALSB, the National School Board Association,

subdivision and site acquisition, Romeo-Brook Council, the Illinois Legislature, and the Nation Year-Round School Organization.

At the same meeting the board approved a policy setting budget parameters to meet the goal of a balanced budget. The criteria set included utilizing resources to result in maximum students education, meeting the statutory and regulatory mandates of the State of Illinois, meeting the employee contracts currently in existence, meeting North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges, and meeting the board's responsibility for employee welfare.

In March 1976, the board adopted a policy on the philosophy of the instructional program. The policy went from a four page statement to two paragraphs. The emphasis in 1973 was that the schools were to be a place where children are nurtured and a place which would insure that the world would become a better place. Through a natural desire to learn, inquiry, self-direction, and the development of the ability to think, the student would be secure in thinking, feelings, and the ability to act. The curriculum was to be organized and based on the belief that students are worthy, unique, curious, inquisitive, capable of unique contributions, and had a potential that needed to be nourished and cherished. It was to be dynamic, growing, open, and changing in an extended learning environment of school, home, and community.

The revised philosophy, however, stressed building basic skills, learning techniques of inquiry, and developing a fund of knowledge. The social responsibility was the introduction of civic and moral values of our cultural history. The main goal was to help students acquire basic knowledge and skills in the approved curriculum guides.

In September 1976, the curriculum improvement cycle was adopted. This policy set forth the belief that the improvement in student learning was a direct result from improved instructional practices. In order to continue the trend of improved student learning, the board committed human and material resources to improve instruction with the following procedures:

1. Determine curricula improvement needs.
2. Develop and install programs designed to meet those needs.
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of the programs.
4. Maintain and adjust programs as appraisals indicate.¹¹

Underlying these procedures were the considerations of the complexity of curriculum improvement, the wisdom of not trying to modify all programs at the same time, and the availability of resources. In adopting this policy the board formally recognized the importance of curriculum and instruction in improving student learning and publicly committed itself to funding and supporting it. As a follow-

¹¹Harry J. Hayes to Board of Education, 11 December 1985, "Board Workshop on Monday, December 16," Policy 6130.

up to the high school curriculum/course review, the board adopted the high school graduation requirements policy on 26 November 1979.

FINANCE

During 1974-1979 the district continued to experience problems with financial resources. The Will County Treasurer was late in distributing monies to the district. This resulted in cash flow difficulties, and the district was selling tax anticipation warrants as a short term measure to meet expenditures. The net effect was a financial loss since the district had to pay interest on the money borrowed as well as lose money due to lack of funds for short-term investing. In addition, in 1975 the staff was being paid by teacher orders which required that interest be paid at a later date for those orders not cashed.

In 1974 the board had some relief when the capital development board approved interest free funds for construction of buildings. The state would own the buildings until the district had repaid the loan as rent payments over the next sixteen and one half years.

During the same year contract negotiations had taken place with the American Federation of Teachers. By October both the board and the union had agreed to binding arbitration. In December the arbitration hearings were

held, and a decision was expected in ninety days. By April 1975, a decision still had not been received. In June the arbitrator's decision had been made in favor of the district. It was pointed out that Valley View School District was one of the poorest districts in the state based on assessed valuation per student.

In May 1975, Will County proposed imposing a 1 percent collection fee on all taxing bodies in the county. The board immediately acted with a resolution to Will County opposing the fee. In the resolution they stressed that it would cost them \$110,000, taxpayers were already paying for tax collection and distribution through the General Revenues earmarked for the county, and more dollars would be lost due to interest from tax anticipation warrants as well as the loss of money for short-term investments. The district attorney sent a letter to the County Treasurer requesting the accounting tabulation and data upon which the cost estimates had been based. He also stated that the board had a difficult time accepting the fact that it would cost \$110,000 to collect taxes for the school district. In June the board approved a motion for the district attorney to explore the possibility of a joint lawsuit with the other taxing bodies against the county. The lawsuit would require disclosure of cost accounting information, declare the fee excessive, and attack the constitutionality of the Statute.

In the end the 1 percent collection fee did not get approved.

In order to keep the schools operational, the board allowed deficit spending to occur even though a 1975 policy called for a balanced budget. At the 14 April 1975 meeting, the Board of Education approved the \$2 million deficit budget. The educational fund, building and maintenance fund, working cash fund, and rent fund were balanced. The bond and interest fund had a \$10,000 surplus, while the transportation fund had a \$16,000 deficit. The bulk of the deficit was in the site and construction fund.

By 30 June 1976, the education fund had a deficit of \$7,635,000 which was the highest deficit in the history of the district. As a result borrowing money was more difficult. When the district could borrow, it cost more due to higher interest rates.

In 1978 the district initiated its own medical benefits program and installed privately owned telephone systems in two buildings within the district. In 1979 the district reduced the transportation deficit by transporting only those students who resided more than a mile and a half from their attendance center. This still left the transportation fund with a \$55,000 deficit. The proposed return to a nine-month calendar was another savings of \$2,000,000, and not opening any more schools was a savings of \$125,000. The stabilization and slight decline in enrollment was also a

savings in instructional materials and services costs. The budget proposed for fiscal year 1980 reflected the beginnings of a balanced budget. An increase in state aid due to the state aid formula using a weighted average daily attendance and an increase in assessed valuations assisted in balancing the budget. Table four shows Valley View's wealth during the 1970s.

Table 4

Valley View District 365U Wealth During the 1970s

School Year	Assessed Valuation	Pupil Enrollment Beginning of Year	Per-Pupil Assessed Valuation
1971-1972	\$159,184,116	10,587	\$15,035
1972-1973	183,591,589	11,285	16,268
1973-1974	202,186,061	12,340	16,384
1974-1975	230,440,168	13,045	17,665
1975-1976	259,120,304	13,604	19,047
1976-1977	267,026,410	13,915	19,189
1977-1978	302,359,710	13,702	22,066
1978-1979	239,523,881	13,452	17,805
1979-1980	265,126,155	13,783	19,235

(Source: Annual Reports 1971-1978; Comprehensive Annual Financial Report 1984)

In 1970 the tax rate for District 96 was \$2.609.

Information for 1971 is not available since that was when Valley View Community Unit District 365U was formed. Table five shows the tax rates for the unit district from 1972 until 1979.

Table 5

Valley View 365U's Local Tax Rate in the 1970s
 Combined Rate in Dollars per Year
 \$100 of Assessed Valuation

1971-1972	\$5.0885
1972-1973	5.3540
1973-1974	5.5690
1974-1975	5.2870
1975-1976	5.7735
1976-1977	5.7754
1977-1978	5.7210
1978-1979	5.9072
1979-1980	6.5871

(Source: Annual Reports 1971-1979; Comprehensive Annual Financial Report 1984)

This chapter described the key organizational changes that were implemented to bring about improvement in student achievement. In review the Board of Education committed the district to adopting the six conditions that would guide and control student learning.

1. Direction from the Board of Education in policy (for student expectations) and resources. The board adopted policies in instructional philosophy, curriculum improvement which included the provision of resources, budget parameters, and high school graduations requirement. They did not, however, specify the standard of performance for students other than they were to learn the material in the curriculum guides.
2. Community and school commitment to the philosophy that students can learn and that learning is important. With the assistance of Dr. Brickell from

Policy Studies in Education, the district administered individual intelligence tests to demonstrate the validity of the Otis Lennon scores, surveyed administrators, teachers, aides, and parents to identify what works to get students to learn, administered standardized achievement tests, and reported the results. The data coupled with the initial improvement of scores helped build the faith and belief in the fact that Valley View students could learn. Once people believed that something could be achieved, they would work to make it happen again. Previous reports said that Valley View students couldn't improve because of ability, socio-economic factors, and parents (factors similar to those found in the Coleman Report). The main problem was a lack of specificity and accountability as to what students were to learn, a lack of measuring and monitoring progress, and a low expectation level.

3. Centralized curriculum improvement with a district-level administrator in charge, rational procedure for curriculum work, and expected educational outcomes in student learning terms. This area was one of the first to be addressed. Guidelines and procedures for project work and a curriculum review cycle was adopted. Project Management was

implemented as the organizational basis of operation. This system defined the work to be done, the operational responsibility, and the time frame for completion. Effectiveness and efficiency were increased by clearly defining the steps of the project and eliminating duplication of effort. Dr. Pankake was hired as the line administrator in charge and had complete control over the resources available for instruction.

4. Provision of resources for instruction in terms of instructional staff, supervisory staff, instructional materials, and evaluation instruments. In this area instructional staff and materials were already provided. There was little control over which materials were selected and used. With the curriculum cycle in place, the adoption of materials was centralized so consistency was established. Supervisory staff was provided for by the change in the organization of the elementary and middle schools from assistant principal to team leader and administrative aide. Evaluation instruments for the district curriculum and the yearly "independent audit" was addressed through the curriculum department.
5. Management and supervision of instruction by defining the principal's priority job, selecting

individuals who understand the priority and are capable of performing it, and establishing an ongoing instructional supervision system. Dr. Pankake clearly defined the job and initiated goal setting with quarterly management review meetings. He conducted or provided inservice training for the principals, team leaders, and administrative aides to ensure that all knew how their job fit into the whole instructional and organizational scheme.

6. Independent audit of educational achievement done periodically. This was implemented within two years utilizing Policy Studies in Education. The math curriculum revision was in place as was the goal setting. The reporting to parents regarding the progress being made to improve learning was ready to begin. The initial independent audit included not only achievement of test data, but ability (both group and individual), and the results of the surveys. The first year set the baseline of what current levels of achievement were, how much could be expected based on ability, and what techniques worked with students.

Chapter Four covers the years 1980 to 1988. Since the organizational framework was in place in curriculum, instructional materials and resources, management, and policy, the focus was on refining the instructional and

leadership techniques of the staff to achieve ongoing gains in student learning. Problems still existed in the areas of space, and finance, but the basic structure was in operation. The Illinois Reform Legislation was passed during this next time period which impacted on the activities of the district.

CHAPTER IV

VALLEY VIEW DISTRICT 1980-1988

With the curriculum alignment, management organization, policy development, and instructional supervision components in operation, the focus from 1980-1988 was from district level operations of ongoing assessment and development of curriculum to building level instructional alignment through the refinement of teaching and supervision skills and the improvement of instruction. The main goal was to continue to improve student achievement through the refinement of instructional methodology and techniques. During this period the district experienced a change of superintendents, the retirement of Dr. Pankake, the resulting change in the administrative table of organization, a strong commitment to staff development, a major budget crisis with significant cutbacks, the return to the nine-month school year, the burning and reconstruction of an elementary school, the passage of the Illinois School Reform Legislation, and the recognition of excellence by the U.S. Department of Education.

ENROLLMENT AND HOUSING

As discussed in the last chapter, beginning in 1978-1979 student enrollment began declining in the elementary and middle schools. After a study on student housing, the data indicated that the district could return to a nine-month calendar for the 1980-1981 school year. From 1981-1982 school year to 1986-1987, the average loss in elementary enrollment was 210 students. The middle schools experienced an average increase of 85.5 students from 1981 to 1983, but then averaged a loss of 97.5 students until 1986. The high schools averaged an increase of 82.5 students during that period of time. Responding to this change, it was necessary to change school boundaries to balance the number of students at each school. Bolingbrook High School was still increasing in enrollment. In order to relieve the enrollment pressure at Bolingbrook High School, the board decided at the 26 November 1979 meeting that all grade eight and high school students new to the district would attend Romeoville High School.

On 1 January 1980 disaster struck the district. Oak View Elementary School caught fire and burned to the ground. The Superintendent acted quickly so students would have a school to attend after the winter vacation. All one thousand Oak View students attended North View School on double sessions under the supervision of one principal. The superintendent chose this action to provide some stability

for the students in terms of remaining with the same teachers, being together as a unit, and the close proximity of the two schools. North View parents were not pleased with the decision and presented their opposition in the form of a petition at the 7 January 1980 board meeting. The petition urged the board to find an alternative plan so that both schools could return to full days as soon as possible.

At the 28 April 1980 meeting, the board took action to relocate the Oak View students so that full day school could be provided. Students and teachers would be relocated to R.C. Hill and Valley View Schools in Romeoville, North View, Independence, and Jamie McGee Schools in Bolingbrook.

The board reported that the district's goal was to have Oak View ready to reopen for the 1981-1982 school year. This goal was set since 40 percent of the steel structure and most of the interior walls were usable. The goal was reached, and the school reopened in 1981-1982.

By 1983 the board had another difficult decision to make due to the decline in enrollment -- whether to close an elementary school in Romeoville. John Lukancic, Assistant Superintendent of Personnel, analyzed records of enrollment trends as a basis for enrollment and personnel projections. A newspaper article from 16 February 1983 summarized the demographic data upon which the recommendation had been made. There had been a decrease in the district over the past four years with the greatest loss in the Romeoville

area. In 1977 two-thirds of the district's enrollment came from Bolingbrook, and by 1983 the percentage had risen to three-fourths. At the same time that Bolingbrook's student population was growing, Romeoville's was decreasing at a greater rate. Therefore, the overall effect was decreasing enrollment in the district.

Valley View School in Romeoville was the one chosen to be closed. The 302 students would be housed at R.C. Hill Elementary School which had eight vacant rooms. Some of the students currently attending R.C. Hill (formerly Park View) would be redistricted to Irene King School (formerly Ridge View) which had two empty rooms. This change would not increase transportation costs since all students were within walking distance of the new school. The elementary student/teacher ratio would remain at twenty-nine to one.

Financially the district would save approximately \$110,000 per year by closing the school. This was financially practical since the district was facing \$500,000 less revenue than expected due to the lower Corporate Income Tax payment. Additional revenue was to be generated by renting part of Valley View School to Joliet Junior College. Another aspect to the consideration of closing the school was the possibility of moving the administrative center there. By 1985 the district would have to pay rent to the Fountaindale Library District for the administrative offices. The move could result in lower utility costs and

more efficient utilization of space. The final decision to close Valley view was made at the 14 February 1983 school board meeting.

FINANCE

Strides were being taken by the district in the late 1970s to balance the budget and implement the philosophical changes in the approach to financing the school district. Events in the early 1980s, however, made balancing the budget very difficult without cutting services and programs.

One of the side effects of the burning of Oak View was the increasing demand by parents and the fire department to install sprinklers in Oak View and the rest of the schools. In response to the pressure, a feasibility study was conducted in 1980. An independent consulting firm was selected to assure objectivity and to report credible conclusions. In September 1980 the firm presented to the board a summary of the process of the study and the estimated total cost. The cost estimate for sixteen schools was \$3 million, and the estimated installation time was 950 days. The community approved the project and issued bonds in April 1981. During this year the sprinkler systems were installed in all of the schools.

In the fall of 1981 the General Assembly passed legislation concerning the guidelines on large corporation real estate assessments and clarified a 1975 law on the

assessment of pollution control devices owned by utility companies. An additional problem with the legislation was that the tax exempt status was to be retroactive to 1975. Commonwealth Edison claimed that the district owed them \$1.8 million in over-assessed taxes on pollution control devices, and Citizens Utilities claimed over \$300,000. At the same time Commonwealth Edison, Citizens Utilities, Texaco, Old Chicago, Material Service, and Vavrus claimed that they were over-assessed on regular tax bills from 1976 to 1980 for a combined total of \$2.8 million. The result was a refund of nearly \$900,000 since the time to appeal a tax protest case had elapsed. The school district had not been notified of the protest because the law did not require notification. The school district attorney filed a petition in Will County Circuit Court which challenged the constitutionality of the laws. The district would experience the loss of nearly \$5 million in tax revenues as a result of the General Assembly's actions.

Because of a Supreme Court decision in Com. Edison Co. v. Department of Local Government Affairs, 85 Ill. 2d 495, 426 N.E. 817 (1981) where the utilities' statutory interpretation of Section 21a-3 was upheld, the circuit and appellate courts ruled against the district. On 4 October 1983 the Illinois Supreme court consolidated all three cases and accepted the petition for appeal. Attorney Moss believed there would be a six to nine month period before a

decision would be rendered. The Illinois Supreme Court affirmed the Appellate Court's decision. The district had to refund \$1.3 million to the utilities.

The bonds that had been sold to equip the schools built in the 1970s, to maintain the Life Safety codes, and to install sprinkler systems in the schools continued to be a drain on the financial resources of the district. In addition there were bonds to pay from District 96 and 211 which were incurred prior to the formation of the unit district. In October 1982 the board approved the recommendation to refund the bonds. This action would allow the district to issue new bonds to refund all of the existing ones. The new bonds retirement schedule would be two years longer than the current schedule, but the bond and interest tax rate would be reduced from \$1.40 to \$.77 per \$100 assessed valuation. The overall effect would be the reduction of taxes for the taxpayers. The district Treasurer, Mr. Swinford, believed that the existing debt structure placed a disproportionate tax burden on the present taxpayers in relation to the life expectancy of the facilities. Table six shows the tax rates in the 1980s.

Table 6

Valley View's Local Tax Rate in the 1980s
Combined Rate in dollars per
\$100 of Assessed Valuation

Year	Tax Rate
1980-1981	\$6.0849
1981-1982	5.4965
1982-1983	5.4560
1983-1984	5.4988
1984-1985	5.5318
1985-1986	5.5437
1986-1987	5.5924

(Source: Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports 1984, 1988)

A second recommendation was to investigate alternative means of short term borrowing, such as Working Cash Bonds. By utilizing them, the short term needs could be met and yet the tax rate would be considerably below the current structure. Mr. Swinford also recommended insuring the bonds to increase their marketability and to improve the interest rate.

In other cost savings measures the district began making significant personnel cuts beginning in 1981. For the 1981-1982 school year seven elementary teacher positions would be eliminated; all media center paraprofessionals positions discontinued; one Special Education central office administrator position, truant officer, accountant, curriculum coordinator, three district secretary positions, five Team Leader positions, three central supply positions; three certified nurses replaced with health aides; reduction of dean, summer counselor, and team leader contracts; elementary art and music positions cut by five each; ten-

month contract for the assistant director of food services; and the elimination of the administrative aide position in food services.

For the 1982-1983 school year, the student-teacher ratio was increased by one student (reduction of seventeen staff members); Learning Disabilities Resource teachers reduced by seven positions; social work and speech services by one staff member each; the director of accounting position and one administrative aide position eliminated; three clerk/secretarial positions reduced at the district office; one challenge coordinator and one curriculum coordinator position eliminated; and one media center position at each high school dropped. The curriculum cycle was amended to a six year interval. These reductions resulted in savings of approximately \$788,000.

Another economic measure taken in 1982 was the decision to invest in an energy management system. Funds from the federal government were utilized to conduct an indepth energy audit. Through the assistance of an energy management consulting company, a comprehensive program was submitted to the United States Department of Energy for approval. The major aspect of the program was the installation of a computerized energy management system. This system monitored outside air temperatures, programed the units to run at different times depending upon the need, maintained minimum temperatures during night hours,

monitored the operation of the various pieces of equipment for possible maintenance or repair needs, and used an equipment alarm function for equipment failure. In addition a security component monitored heat and smoke detectors, operated ultra-sound and light sensitive motion detectors, identification card access boxes, contact sensitive doors and locks, and monitored the electronic parts of the sprinkler system and the water pressure in the system against tampering. District personnel could monitor the status of the security system in each building and at the main terminal. It also contained a back-up alarm system for emergencies. The total cost was \$780,000, but the payback time was estimated to be four to five years. In addition the energy conservation grant with life-safety funds totaled \$107,000, and the balance would be paid through construction funds. The savings were enhanced since the system operated on microwaves instead of telephone lines.

By January 1983 the district had a half-million dollar loss due to reduction in state aid and to the Corporate State Income Tax being below the anticipated funding level. To conserve what funds were left, the board approved a freeze on equipment and supply purchases, a reduction in warehouse and maintenance inventories, the replacement of only those personnel required for daily operations, any out-of-district Special Education placement recommendations required Superintendent review and approval, the review and

restraint of all Workmen's Compensation claims, monitoring of energy costs, the elimination and/or delay of inservice and staff development programs, and the hiring of those substitutes absolutely necessary for office and building operations.

At the 28 March 1983 meeting the board made cuts equalling \$1,941,998 in an effort to balance the budget. The cuts were as follows:

1. Close Valley View School
2. Reduce administrative inservice
3. Complete Early Retirement
4. Reduce administrative growth budget by \$15,000 and delete administrative merit pay
5. Move the administrative center and central supply to Valley View
6. Transfer utility cost to fund two
7. Discontinue police liaison
8. Reduce regular staff nine positions
9. Discontinue eight Special Education positions
10. Reduce non-required travel
11. Drop 6-8 deans and reduce 9-12 deans' calendars by ten days
12. Drop 6-8 counselors and reduce 9-12 counselors' calendars by five days
13. Drop one aide per middle school
14. Cut co-curricular travel

15. Initiate co-curricular fees at the middle and high schools
16. Football Players buy insurance
17. Cut testing budget
18. Reduce the instructional equipment budget for K-5, multi-media, and vocational education; reduce the textbook budget by five dollars per student; and reduce the student supply budget by two dollars per student
19. Drop the enrollment department
20. Drop the Deputy Superintendent position and the corresponding secretarial position
21. Drop one Special Education administrator
22. Drop one payroll clerk
23. Reduce print shop help
24. Drop four secretaries in grades six through eight
25. Drop four nurses and add four health aides
26. Combine district delivery service
27. Drop four curriculum coordinators and two curriculum secretaries
28. Drop Team Leaders' extra days and stipends
29. Reduce Vocational Education Director's calendar to ten months
30. Drop Director of Personnel
31. Drop K-5 art, music, and physical education
32. Freeze administrative salaries

This action enabled the district to meet the legal requirements for releasing teachers. The result of the action taken by the board was that all certified staff hired after 1970 were issued letters of termination. There were many certified staff in the terminated positions that had many years of service in the district. These staff members had to be placed in teaching positions prior to anyone who was hired after them.

Taxpayers were upset over the cutbacks in light of the amount of taxes that they were paying. They presented a petition requesting a referendum regarding the working cash bonds because of a lack of information and misunderstanding. Two board members offered to resign if the petition were withdrawn because of the amount of revenue that would be lost due to the delay. The parents refused. The referendum was held in the fall and passed thanks to the intensive public information program that was used.

At the next board meeting on 11 April 1983, The board made additional budget modifications. These were:

1. Eliminate nine secretarial positions at K-5 (one per building)
2. Reduce Administrative Aide days to two hundred and reduce the salary to \$16,900
3. Restore the middle school deans
4. Restore five art, five music, and ten physical education positions for K-5

5. Restore the enrollment department

The 9 May 1983 meeting entailed the adoption of a revised Table of Organization. This was necessary since some central administrative positions were eliminated.

Part of the financial difficulties were due not only to the delays in receiving tax distributions from the county treasurer, but to the fluctuating assessed valuation of property. As pointed out by School Board Member Richard Kavanagh at the 26 October 1987 board meeting the district had been very efficient in the utilization of revenues. Compared to Naperville, which had a comparable enrollment, Valley View had about one-fourth the money with which to provide students with an education. Naperville had an assessed valuation of \$970,000,000 and Valley View had \$284,000,000. Table seven shows the wealth of the district during the 1980s.

Table 7

Valley View District Wealth During the 1980s

School Year	Assessed Valuation	Pupil Enrollment Beginning of Year	Per-Pupil Assessed Valuation
1980-1981	\$299,979,422	13,703	\$21,891
1981-1982	303,338,465	13,684	22,167
1982-1983	294,315,221	13,622	21,605
1983-1984	297,536,328	13,467	22,093
1984-1985	284,828,614	13,303	21,410
1985-1986	283,139,521	13,124	21,574
1986-1987	292,152,026	12,950	22,560

(Source: Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports 1984, 1988)

One of the major problems with which the district had to contend was the delay in receiving tax money which

resulted in the sale of tax anticipation warrants. This meant that the district had even less revenue with which to operate since it had to pay interest on the warrants. Meanwhile the County Treasurer was earning interest on the money that he held for the district and refused to distribute in a timely manner. In an effort to improve the timeliness with which tax monies were distributed from the county treasurer, the board, in 1975, directed the district's attorney to initiate litigation against him. In 1983 Attorney Moss reported that the court ruled that the county treasurer had to pay the district interest on any tax monies being held. This ruling removed the incentive for the delay in distributing the monies to the school district. The remaining question being considered by the court was whether the county treasurer must return interest earned on tax monies in prior years. The final ruling would affect all 102 Illinois counties with a statewide financial impact of \$500,000,000. Attorney Moss believed it unlikely that the court would rule in favor of retroactive reimbursement.

On 9 April 1984 the board adopted the amended budget which had revenues greater than expenditures by \$1,810,401. The budget reflected a seventy-nine cent increase in tax collections for the education rate, building-operation-maintenance rate, transportation rate, and the working cash rate. The other amendments were the modification of the budget format to a modified accrual basis. By utilizing

this method of accounting the budget matched the Annual Financial Report.

Throughout the 1980s the local taxpayers continued to be the primary source of revenue for the district. Table eight shows that since 1984 the state has been closer to a fifty-fifty split with the local level than ever before.

Table 8

Sources of Revenue
1980-1987
Reported in Percentages

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Local	61.7	55.3	56.8	55.2	49.2	50.6	48.3	49.2
State	35.4	40.7	38.8	41.2	46.2	44.2	47.4	46.7
Federal	1.9	1.6	1.7	1.7	2.1	.9	1.6	2.2
Other	1.1	2.4	2.8	2.0	2.4	3.3	2.7	1.8

(Source: 1987 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report)

In 1985 the Illinois General Assembly approved educational reforms which included a revision in the state aid formula. There was to be an infusion of money to help districts pay for the additional mandates from the reform legislation. By 1987 there was no revision of the state aid formula. At the 26 May 1987 board meeting State Representative Larry Wennlund told the board that there were basic unfairness in funding dual and unit districts. In the building fund dual districts were allowed a total of fifty cents per \$100 of assessed valuation where unit districts were limited to thirty-five cents per \$100. In the state aid formula the average daily attendance computation allows dual districts to select the best three months for

elementary and the best three months for secondary. Unit districts must select the best three months for K-12. In his opinion the state legislature needed to modify these inequities.

One of the basic obstacles in the revision of the state aid formula was money. In a Chicago Tribune article from 19 April 1987, state senators and educators estimated that an overhaul of the formula would require \$300 million to \$600 million new money in addition to the \$93 million already in the proposed budget. Governor Thompson was leading a strong campaign for an increase in taxes by urging municipalities and districts to encourage legislators to support the tax increases. He clearly stated that significant cuts in educational funding would result without the adoption of the tax plan. The tax increase did not pass, and school districts were left with the dilemma of how to provide quality educational programs with less money, meet the reform mandates, and maintain a balanced budget.

In preparing the budget for the 1987-1988 school year, Treasurer Swinford stated that the 1986 assessed valuation was down \$12,707 while salaries, benefits, utility and liability insurance costs, textbooks, materials, and services increased. The DuPage Township assessor projected a \$20 million growth in assessed valuation for the next five years based on the present economic growth with low interest rates, the building of the DuPage Tollway, and continued

commercial development. This increase would not be realized for a few years yet. The board approved Dr. Hayes' recommendation to use educational fund balances plus cutbacks to balance the educational fund.

Discussions continued concerning the reduced state funding, increased costs, and the ongoing problem of trying to balance the budget. At the 23 November 1987 board meeting Dr. Hayes stated that a deficit of \$3.3 million was projected for the 1988-1989 school year. A resolution was passed to utilize the Illinois School District Liquid Asset Fund Plus Cash-Flow Borrowing Program with General Tax Anticipation Notes to generate about \$50,000 in interest. The procedure allowed the district to borrow at one rate and reinvest it at a higher rate.

At the 14 December 1987 board meeting, a public hearing was held to adopt an amended 1987 tax levy. By law, the board must hold a public hearing if the amended levy is in excess of 105 percent of the extensions of property taxes for the preceding year. Since the board was proposing an increase of 24.44 percent, the hearing was held so the board could hear the reasons and the community be given the opportunity to be heard. During the hearing Treasurer Swinford reported that the projected assessed valuation was expected to increase by 4.2 percent for 1987. With the increase in the operating levy for the transportation fund and the Special Education fund, the tax rate would be

increased from \$5.54 per \$100 of assessed valuation to \$5.5724.

In a board workshop on 29 February 1988, Treasurer Swinford stated that an additional two million dollars in revenue would be generated through the issuance of Life Safety and Tort Immunity bonds. He also pointed out that fund balances could not be used because they were used for the fiscal year 1988 budget. If they were used, Moody's Investment Rating Service would carefully reassess the district's current "A" rating the next time bonds came up for sale. Lowered fund balances and a deficit budget would not be to the district's advantage.

Possible reductions for 1988-1989 were as follows:

1. Administrative support staff	
a. District (five positions)	\$150,000
b. Schools (eliminate Team Leaders and Administrative Aides. Replace with Associate Principals)	390,000
2. District-wide services	150,000
3. Co-curricular	60,000
4. Special Education	75,000
5. Regular Education (30 positions)	660,000
	<hr/>
	Total \$1,485,000

In the 2 March 1988 issue of The Sun, an article stated that there was an anticipated increase in assessed valuation of \$50 million. This would yield approximately two million dollars in tax income, but also would result in a loss of state aid revenue. The net profit to the district of the \$50 million increase was about \$600,000. The article also indicated that the steady economic growth of the area

increased businesses and brought in more students. The result would be a student boom in the 1990s.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

With the ongoing concern regarding district finances, teachers and students focused on the fundamental purpose of education -- learning. Substantial improvements in student achievement had been seen during the 1970s as the curriculum and instructional supervision and management programs were implemented. The results of the 1979-1980 basic skills testing program proved to be no different. The report from Policy Studies in Education stated that for the fifth year in a row the scores were at the highest level yet experienced at all grade levels. In English grades one through six were above the national average on every subtest. Grades one through four ranged from the sixtieth to eightieth percentiles, while grades seven through ten scored between the thirtieth to fifty-fifth percentiles. Grades seven through ten improved twice as much as grades one through six.

In mathematics all grades were above the national average and scored better than 60 percent of all students nationwide on twenty-nine out of the thirty-three subtests. The elementary grades scored between the sixty-fifth and ninetieth percentiles. Other trends noted were that all schools improved in English and mathematics, the students in

the gifted program continued to improve, and the ability level of the students continued to rise. As before, the more English and mathematics that the students learned, the more capable they were to learn even more the next year. This continued to reinforce the belief that Valley View students were capable of learning more and more.

The September 1980 Valley View News summarized how the test results were being used. Dr. Pankake reviewed how the results determined where strong and weak points were in the instructional program, where improvements were being made, and monitored an individual's progress from year to year. All of the data was used to monitor progress so improvement could be seen each year. The 1980-1981 school year would have an additional emphasis -- the assessment of new achievement tests. As a school district changed and modified the curriculum, the tests must be reevaluated as well. They become outdated, and must be kept current with the curriculum to be a useful assessment tool for program evaluation.

The 1980-1981 results proved better yet and set another all-time Valley View record for improvement in grades one through eleven. In mathematics all grades reached as a minimum the sixtieth percentile on all subtests. The elementary grades continued to show the strongest performance. In English there was improvement on forty-two of the forty-four subtests. The elementary grades were

scoring between the sixtieth and eighty-fifth percentiles. Although students in grades nine and ten were still below the national average, there was improvement on all ten subtests. As before all schools improved, the gifted students performed even better, and for future learning, the students showed higher ability to learn even more.

From August to October 1981 conversations were held with Dr. Brickell from Policy Studies in Education regarding the future Valley View testing program. The key issue was the possible selection of a new achievement test that would be more current. Ones being considered were the Stanford, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), and the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). Dr. Brickell reported that both the Stanford and the ITBS had editions from 1973 and 1977-78 respectively. The CTBS had a new 1981 edition with a correlating ability test (Test of Cognitive Skills).

By December 1981 the CTBS had been selected as the new achievement test beginning in 1982. The March 1982 issue of the Valley View News summarized the reasoning behind the change. The main reason was that the old tests were normed in 1969 and 1973. This prohibited the district from comparing the students to their 1981 contemporaries throughout the nation. In addition the curriculum had been revised through the ongoing curriculum cycle. To maintain the ability to assess program effectiveness, a newer test with a good match to the curriculum was necessary. The CTBS

would allow the district to evaluate student learning on broader terms than single item learning. Prior to selection a trial sample was tested on both the CTBS and the STEP and a comparison of the results made. The CTBS performed better than expected. Dr. Brickell was given the job of providing a mechanism so that the test scores continued to be meaningful.

To provide a permanent yardstick for measuring growth over the past seven years, the old tests were retained for grades five, eight, and ten. The new tests were adopted for the rest of the grades as a bench mark for comparison with students in 1982. In his report to the Board of Education, Dr. Brickell stressed that achievement test scores were up twenty to thirty points higher on a one hundred point scale than they were seven years ago. In the elementary grades the average student computed better than 85 percent of the nation, made practical applications better than 80 percent, knew grammar and punctuation better than 75 percent, knew vocabulary better than 70 percent and could read and spell better than 65 percent. Ability scores were up twenty points higher than seven years previously. Compared to the nation they were better than three out of four students.

In reporting on the new tests Dr. Brickell indicated that student performance on tests slipped nationwide from 1971 to 1981. The school would not have to improve to get higher scores; it would just have to hold steady while the

national average dropped. Valley View improved on the tests because nationwide performance was dropping, but also because it continued to improve while the nation got worse. In grades four and up there was an average increase of five to ten points with the change of test. Another point that he made was that the students did not do better on the old test because of practice. The fact that they scored higher on the new test indicated that they were learning better.

The steady improvement had been due to the board and administration getting back to the basics. The focus began with the elementary grades and progressed upward until all grades had been addressed. The scores showed that what had been learned had been retained as the students moved through the grades, and the downward slope was beginning to level off.

There was no standardized achievement testing program for the 1982-1983 school year in an effort to reduce costs to balance the budget. The board approved a motion to reduce the general achievement program by 50 percent at the 11 April 1983 meeting. The reduction would result in a scaled down program for 1984, and Policy Studies In Education would no longer be utilized.

The tenth anniversary of the development, implementation, and administration of the student improvement program was in 1984. All students were tested with the CTBS as in previous years. The student achievement

report focused on the performance of grades three, five, and eight and ten in reading, mathematics, and English. Tables nine, ten, and eleven show the change in achievement from 1974 to 1984.

Table 9

Change in Math Achievement
District Totals
By National Percentiles
1974 - 1980 - 1984

Grades	1974	1980	1984
3	56	77	82
5	42	76	90
8	36	60	81
10	32	58	73

(Source: Student Achievement Report 1983-1984)

Table 10

Change in Reading Achievement
District Totals
By National Percentiles
1976 - 1980 - 1984

Grades	1974	1980	1984
3	41	54	65
5	42	56	71
8	34	42	66
10	33	40	53

(Source: Student Achievement Report 1983-1984)

Table 11

Change in English Achievement
District Totals
By National Percentiles
1976 - 1980 - 1984

Grades	1974	1980	1984
3	43	--	75
5	38	56	83
8	27	43	78
10	25	34	69

(Source: Student Achievement Report 1983-1984)

Overall student performance was above the national average in all areas at all grades. Student enrollment in high school academic courses continued to rise with maintenance of above average achievement. Students who took advanced placement tests in calculus, English, U.S. History, biology, chemistry, and computer science scored above the national average. Dr. Hayes outlined a long term strategy which included maintaining and improving basic skill achievement, continued the internal monitoring system, utilized curriculum projects under the direction of the curriculum directors to continue basic skill achievement, restated the principal's responsibility to deliver and monitor the curriculum, continued effective instruction by teachers with support from the board, parents, students district administrators, and the superintendent.

In addition a special report titled "In Pursuit of Excellence: A Report on Continuing Progress in Student Achievement 1974-1984" was prepared. It was dedicated to the Board of Education, district administrators, instructional team leaders, teachers, support staff, and parents/taxpayers who began the Pursuit of Excellence in 1974 with the goal of causing more students to learn more. The report presented background information on the district's history, the 1984 results compared to 1984, and the description of the plan written by Dr. Pankake. The epilogue summarized a key aspect to the plan --

"thoughtfully conceived and effectively delivered instruction does produce desirable results."¹

The 1984-1985 results reflected that 70 percent of all scores were in the seventieth to ninetieth percentiles. Looking at growth from 1976 to 1985, there was a range from twenty-two to fifty-three points across the grades. More students enrolled in high school academic classes with above average results. Superintendent Hayes commended everyone since the district had a 25 percent turnover rate in student enrollment. He was also quoted in the 30 August 1985 Tidbits ("Short Stories for Staff Members of District 365U) as saying "this took months and years of work. The story is a magnificent one!"²

In December 1985 Superintendent Hayes planned a board workshop on improving curriculum and instruction. Dr. Hayes summarized the board policies supporting curriculum and instruction, the "essential conditions" that Dr. Pankake established, and the table of organization which supported it. Drs. Moore (K-5) and Eckman (6-12) presented the curriculum review cycle, special projects, and the instructional management system of quarterly reviews. The board then was able to observe a video tape of a quarterly

¹Pankake, David, "Progress in Perspective: The Plan," (Romeoville, Ill.: Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1984), 17

²Hayes, Harry, "1985 Student Achievement Testing Results Good News," Tidbits, 30 August 1985, 1.

review and two live mini-management review demonstrations. This enabled the board to have a better and more in-depth perspective of the backbone behind the improvement in instruction and student achievement.

More growth was evident in the 1985-1986 testing. This year 97 percent of the scores were above the national average with the highest being the ninety-fourth. Of the scores 81 percent were above the seventieth percentile. At the 25 August 1986 board meeting Dr. Moore commented on the upward movement particularly in grades one and three in reading. She was also glad to see that performance in language mechanics had been maintained since the revised language arts curriculum had a heavy emphasis on writing.

The advanced placement testing had the highest number of students taking the test since it began in 1980. In 1980 two students took the test and one scored a three, four, or five (the number needed to receive college credit) on a five point scale. In 1986, 164 took the test and 120 students scored a three, four, or five. Of the students who took the test, 73 percent qualified for college credit in high school. A total of seventy-seven students qualified based on their performance on the test.

The advanced placement testing is a means for high school students to earn college credit by taking advanced placement courses in high school. The advanced placement program is the final sequence for the students in the gifted

program. The students take a more rigorous curriculum at a faster pace which enables them to take advanced placement classes in high school.

Student achievement in 1986-1987 continued in the same pattern as the years before. In mathematics all grade levels scored above the seventy-sixth percentile even though there was no improvement shown at grades five and eight. In reading, the scores ranged from the fifty-second at grade eleven to the seventy-eighth in grade two. Language achievement was higher -- from the seventy-fifth to the eighty-fifth percentile.

The state mandated school report card reports student achievement in the percent of student scoring in the top, the third, the second, and the bottom quartiles. At grade three the district had 35.9 percent in the top quartile, 25.8 percent in the third quartile, 27.3 percent in the second quartile, and 11 percent in the bottom quartile in reading. Mathematics showed 51.6 percent in the top, 28.9 percent in the third, 13.3 in the second, and 6.2 percent in the bottom quartile.

In reading, grade six had 41.6 percent in the top, 29.5 percent in the third, 18.4 percent in the second, and 10.5 percent in the bottom. Mathematics showed 54.3 percent in the top, 25 percent in the third, 12.3 in the second, and 8.4 percent in the bottom quartile.

In grade eight, reading had 42.6 percent in the top, 31.2 percent in the third, 17.1 percent in the second, and 9.1 percent in the bottom. Mathematics had 44.4 percent in the top, 30.9 percent in the third, 18.4 percent in the second, and 6.3 percent in the bottom.

There was a consistent pattern of performance in these grade levels in that the percentage in each quartile was very similar. To achieve the mean scores over the years on the CTBS, it was necessary to have a spread of scores very similar to these. The advantage of looking at the spread, was to see whether a large top group was supporting a large low group with fewer numbers in the middle quartiles. If the goal was to have all students learn more, then the goal should be single digit numbers in the bottom quartile and larger numbers of students in the top and third.

Grade ten did not maintain the pattern, but high school scores still had not reached the level of performance shown in the elementary and middle schools. One high school principal in the district reported that only about 50 percent of the high school students had started their school career in Valley View. This partially explained the difficulty in raising the high school scores so that they were commensurate with the elementary and middle schools. In reading grade, ten had 36.2 percent in the top quartile, 23.9 percent in the third, 23 percent in the second, and 16.9 percent in the bottom. In mathematics there were 47.9

percent in the top, 25.7 percent in the third, 14 percent in the second, and 12.4 percent in the bottom.

Mr. Kavanagh, school board member, pointed out that the continued academic performance of the students was indicative of efficient and effective district operation in spite of substantial cutbacks in state aid and a lower assessed valuation. Many districts with a higher assessed valuation and a comparable number of students didn't have a track record of improving student achievement like Valley View did.

For 1987-1988 only students in grades one, three, five, six, eight, nine, and eleven were administered the CTBS. 96 percent of all of the subtest scores were above the national average. Anywhere between 46 to 89 percent of the students scored above the national average. All grade levels were above the eightieth percentile except for grade eight which was six points below the 1986-1987 group. This year was the first time that grade eleven was tested in math, and they performed at the sixty-seventh percentile. Reading continued to show strong performance with first and third graders were above the seventy-first percentile, fifth graders were above the seventy-fourth percentile, sixth was above the seventy-second and eighth graders were above the sixty-sixth percentile. The new reading textbook and program was implemented in 1987, and there was no loss on standardized testing as a result of the transition. At the

high school level reading was above the sixtieth percentile for grade nine while grade eleven was at the national average. Dr. Hayes had the goal of the reading scores being in the seventies or in the top quartile since that was the goal for the lower grades twelve years ago.

On the state school report card, improvement was shown in increasing the number of students in the top quartile and reducing the number in the bottom quartile. In math 56 percent of the third and sixth graders, 41.4 percent of the eighth graders, and 36.7 percent of the tenth graders were in the top quartile. In reading 36.1 percent of the third graders, 44.5 percent of the sixth graders, 40.4 percent of the eighth graders, and 29 percent of the tenth graders were in the top quartile.

The state also introduced a new reading test on constructing meaning. The test was developed by the Illinois Center for Reading and had more than one correct answer to stress to students that many times there is more than one way to construct meaning. On this test third, sixth, and eighth graders out-performed the state average in the percent of students in the top quartile.

In science 33.6 percent of the third graders, 39.2 percent of the sixth graders, 37.1 percent of the eighth graders, and 25.1 percent of the tenth graders were in the top quartile. Tenth graders were a target area in reading

and science since 26.6 percent of the students were in the bottom quartile.

The continued increase in student learning served as a model of excellence to other district throughout the country. In spite of a 25 percent mobility rate, declining enrollment, and financial constraints due to reduced state funding, a well-organized, efficient system of instructional supervision, curriculum development, and high expectations had resulted in the attainment of the original goal set by Dr. Pankake and the board -- getting students to learn more.

RECOGNITION AND ACHIEVEMENT

Formal recognition of twelve years of concentrated work came to the district in May 1987. The U.S. Department of Education named Wood View Elementary School a model of excellence as part of their 1987-1988 School Recognition Program. The purpose of the program was to give public recognition to outstanding schools throughout the nation based on the school's effectiveness in meeting their goals as well as the standards of quality expected in elementary schools. To be selected the school must meet the following requirements:

1. There must be clear evidence of a solid foundation in reading, writing and mathematics.
2. There must be school policies, programs, and practices which foster the development of sound

character, a sense of self-worth, democratic values, ethical judgment, and self-discipline.

3. Instructional programs must include high-quality knowledge in literature, history, geography, science, economics, the arts, and other subjects deemed important by the state, school system, or school.
4. For 1987-1988 special consideration was being given for unusually effective strategies for teaching math and science.
5. There should be strong leadership and an effective working relationship among the school, parents, and others in the community.
6. The school's atmosphere was to be orderly, purposeful, and conducive to learning and good character.
7. The school was to attend to the quality of instruction and the professionalism of the teachers.
8. There was to be a strong commitment to the educational excellence for all students and a record of progress in sustaining the school's best features and solving its problems.

In order to participate in the program the school had to meet a series of criteria which covered the type of school, minimum length of time the school had to be in existence, whether it had met all Civil Rights statutes, and

student achievement. The main qualification criteria for student achievement was meeting one of the following:

1. During each of the last three years, 75 percent or more of the students must have achieved at or above grade level in mathematics and reading.
2. During the last three years, the number of students who achieved at or above grade level in mathematics and reading must have increased an average of at least 5 percent annually. In the last year, 50 percent or more of the students must have achieved at or above grade level in both areas.
3. The school must demonstrate exemplary progress and growth of students in math and reading individually or as a group as determined by a carefully worked out and fully documented system of evaluation.³

If eligible the school had to provide information on school philosophy/goals, organization, leadership, curriculum, instruction, student outcomes, character development, school climate, school-community relations, and efforts to maintain high quality programs and/or to make improvements. The schools were judged in relation to how successfully they met their goals and how well the program was tailored to local needs.

Each state was allowed a number of nominations equal to the size of the congressional delegation. The Chief State School Officers made the nomination. Once received by the U.S. Department of Education, the nomination forms were reviewed by a National Review Panel of public and private school educators, college and university faculty and

³Bennett, William J., "Elementary School Recognition Program" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1987), ii

administrators, state and local school board members, parents, state and local government staff, the education press, the medical profession, and representatives of labor, business, and the general public. The panel recommended schools for on-site visits. Those states or private school communities who were not recommended were reviewed by a separate panel to verify or change the original recommendation.

The on-site visitations were two days in length and were conducted by teams of two. The site visitors were to verify the accuracy of information contained in the nomination form and to get answers to questions posed by the Review Panel. Included in the visit were interviews with staff, parents, school and district administrators, support staff, and parents as well as a minimum of ten classroom observations. There was a prepared set of guidelines and criteria for the review. The written site report was sent to the Review Panel which reviewed all of the reports from the site visitations. The final group of schools was selected for recognition by the Secretary of Education. There was no geographic formula or other guidelines in determining the final group for recognition. Representatives from the recognized schools were invited to Washington for a White House recognition ceremony.

Wood View was one of twenty-four schools selected from seventy-seven applications reviewed at the state level. At

the national level Wood View was one of 287 schools selected as models of excellence. Illinois had seventeen of its schools which made the final selection, and Wood View was the only school in Will County to receive the award.

A special honor was the attendance of Under Secretary of Education, Linus Wright, at the district's recognition dinner party in September 1988. He stated that he had nothing but admiration and praise for the Board of Education, the administration, and the staff that was responsible for Wood View's success. Wood View was unusual, unique, and the kind of people that they wanted to use as a model throughout the country. He likened this accomplishment to being part of the American Dream. Wood View approached its challenge differently than any of the other schools. Diversity has its strength and the school certainly proved that. One of the main reasons that Wood View was the only school selected for a visit was that the school had a lower than state average per pupil expenditure and a higher than state average student achievement level. Dr. Hayes summed it up by pointing out that in the district excellence is the annual goal and perennial success story.

Valley View is again on its way to national recognition. West View Middle School has been selected as one of twenty-four Illinois schools to be finalists in the U.S. Department of Education's School Recognition Program for Secondary Schools. In the past seven years Illinois has

had twenty-seven high schools, junior highs, and middle schools recognized as winners. The winners for 1988-1989 will be announced on 22 May 1989.

POLICY

On 10 February 1986 the board reviewed the final report from Treasurer Swinford and Secretary Jascewski regarding the first major update of the Board Policy Manual. They had spent six months on the review so that it would be current. Since policy guides the direction and operation of the district, it is necessary to periodically review the whole series so that it serves the needs of the times. Only minor changes were made such as shortening titles (Board of Education was changed to "Board"), and eliminating references to Deputy Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent of Student Services, and Assistant Superintendent of Instruction. The three positions were eliminated in the 1983 budget cuts.

The proposed modification to the policy on "Discipline/Punishment" was to specify that only an administrator could administer corporal punishment. If parents objected to it, they must file a written objection in the student's cumulative record. There had been conversations with building administrators and parents as to whether it should be permitted at all, and the final recommendation was this modification.

Final approval of the update was at the 24 February 1986 meeting. Secretary Jascewski presented the final version of the discipline/punishment policy. The revision would include administration of corporal punishment by an administrator with a witness present, and parents objecting could file a written statement in the cumulative record.

In September 1986 the board approved the amendment of the policy on curriculum improvement whereby equivalence would be assured among all schools in terms of teachers, administrators, auxiliary personnel, curriculum materials, and instructional supplies within reasonable identifiable differences among the academic disciplines and grade levels. The addition of this section was necessary to comply with Chapter I Rules and Regulation.

In November 1986 the board adopted a policy on the Philosophy of Education. In it the board summarized its beliefs to provide a foundation for the educational program and to set the framework for continuing improvement. The policy addressed respect for the individual, differences in creed, ethnic background, mental and physical development, race, sex, and socioeconomic status. Through offering a variety of programs, the goal was to have students share common experiences and develop their potential. The educational responsibilities were proficiency in reading, language usage, and mathematics, acquisition of knowledge in other disciplines, and development of higher level thinking

skills. The philosophy also addressed the belief in joint accountability with parents and the community for the areas of citizenship, appreciation of the arts, sciences, and humanities, utilization of leisure time, development of sound health, fitness, and safety habits, and value of life long learning. This was the first time that the board had made a statement outlining what the district was to strive for and subscribe to in its educational endeavors.

A major revision was made in the policy on budget parameters in September 1987. The policy had not been changed since its adoption in 1975. The board added a section addressing the continual problem of revenues being subject to the political process of the state, and therefore, were unpredictable and out of control of the board. Since many times these circumstances can cause emergency situations where the budget could result in a deficit, a plan was developed whereby future real estate property tax monies and state funds would be used to offset these inconsistencies and relieve the pressure on the taxpayer. The plan was as follows:

1. Additional revenues from increased state aid or assessed valuation will be used to replace any funds taken from Ending Fund Balances.
2. The board will continue to increase fund balances until the fund balances equal 25 percent of the estimated annual appropriation in each fund.
3. Any additional funds will be used to reduce the overall tax rate to less than five dollars per hundred of assessed valuation.
4. If after the first three objectives are met, there is a surplus of funds, it will be used for program

expansion and employee salary and benefit increases.⁴

This policy established a specific plan of action to follow for whenever the district found itself in a situation similar to what it was currently experiencing. The policy set a goal and priority system of handling finances if and when they became favorable for the district. It clearly identified what the priority considerations were -- fund balances, the overall tax rate, and last, employee salary and benefits. This policy could have a significant impact on future negotiation scenarios with the teacher's union. The establishment of financial security and taxpayer relief ranked higher than employee satisfaction and security. The past history of the district has been one of financial difficulties and crisis ever since its inception. With the current political climate and economic situation, it is doubtful that objectives one and two will be achieved in the near future.

One of the most controversial policy decisions was in the fall of 1988 when the board decided to raise the grade point average (GPA) for participation in co-curricular activities such as sports, band, and clubs. The Illinois High School Association (IHSA) requirements were a 1.0 (D) quarterly GPA and passing grades in four subjects. The

⁴"Regular Minutes of the Board of Education," Board of Education Minutes, 24 August 1987, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, Romeoville, Illinois, 6613.

review began when one board member requested an investigation into standards and practices in other districts since she wanted a C average of 2.0. In July Superintendent Hayes presented a proposal recommending a GPA of 1.75 plus passing grades in at least four subjects excluding physical education during the period immediately prior to involvement. In the beginning of August another revision was presented that Dr. Hayes believed that teachers and administrators could work with and increase later. The new proposal was a 1.5 GPA (C-) and four passing grades. Incoming sixth and ninth graders would be exempt the first quarter and the other grades would be phased in over a three year period. The board was split in supporting and opposing the new proposal. There were three in favor, two opposed, and two undecided.

Those board members in favor of revising the current standard believed that the district was doing the students a disservice by implying that the focus was not on education. They also voiced their opinion that life required more than a D average. They also believed that this was a problem. By motivating the students with a higher GPA requirement, the district would be helping them. The goal of the district was to continue improving student learning through high but reasonable expectations.

Those board members, parents, and teachers opposed to the proposal expressed concerns regarding a potential

increase in drop out rates, doing a disservice to those students not capable of maintaining a high GPA, and eliminating the option of offering students alternatives to drugs, gangs, and other problems. What options and motivations would be available for those students who cannot make the revised criteria? Do they simply slip through the cracks? What would motivate them to do better in school? One option under investigation was providing some form of tutoring for those students with a GPA below 1.5 whether or not they were in co-curricular activities.

At the board meeting on 12 September teachers, coaches, and parents voiced their opinions on the issue. The coaches estimated that about one-third of the student body maintained less than a 2.0 (C) GPA. They also felt that the new standard would result in unevenness in team sport competition since the other schools follow the current IHSA standard of 1.0. Another concern was that the new GPA would discriminate against minorities and special education students who work very hard to maintain a 1.0. These students would be denied a right that is available to them in the majority of other high schools in Illinois. Some parents expressed their opinion that the board needed to stop looking at sports as a privilege and to continue using it as a teaching aid. If sports could keep a student in school, then use it as a teaching aid. Another parent who worked for the Will County Crisis Line expressed similar

concerns. She indicated that the one thing that the Crisis Line did was to encourage students to get involved in school activities because it builds self-esteem. If school activities were not available truancy would get worse because there would be no way for these students to bolster their self-esteem. Another point made was that students who try hard, don't succeed, and don't know where to turn, try teen suicide and suicide threats.

The student government of Romeoville High School presented a resolution against the proposal of a 1.75 GPA, but supported a 1.5 for similar reasons. Some even gave personal experiences as examples of how co-curricular activities helped them get out of drugs or stay away from them. Some students supported the higher standard. They believed that some students are dedicated to sports and not school. They felt that education was more important in being successful in the future years of their life. Some felt that there was enough time to put effort into both sports and homework even if they had to push themselves.

By the board meeting on 28 September 1988 the final proposal was presented and voted upon. The final version was as follows: a 1.5 quarterly GPA excluding physical education and passing grades in four subjects. This would go into effect for grades six and nine at the start of the second quarter of 1988 and other grades incorporated over four years. Any student who fell below the 1.5 GPA would be

placed on probation and would be required to attend a one hour study period three times a week. The tutoring would be staffed by teachers and academically talented students who would be paid five dollars per hour (not to exceed two hundred hours at each school). The student tutoring and study groups would be available to all students whose GPA was below 1.5 even if they were not in co-curricular. An appeal board consisting of the principal, the activities director, and a classroom teacher would be implemented for those students whose GPA did not improve over 1.5 after probation.

The board added some amendments to the proposal. They were including only Valley View grades in the GPA so transfer students would have a clean slate, the GPA would be computed cumulatively not quarterly, only Valley View grades would be computed not transfer grades, and grade levels would be added yearly so the program would be fully implemented by the 1991-1992 school year. The proposal in final amended form was approved by a four to three vote.

Reactions after the vote were strongest expressed by one of the board members and by the teachers and coaches. The board member stressed his position regarding the concern of losing students since they had no options, questioned the advisability of using student tutors, and the hypocritical nature of the board in pursuing this nature. He reminded them of how they lobbied against state mandates that weren't

funded and yet turned around and mandated tutors when the district doesn't have the money to pay for them. The estimated cost was approximately \$2900 for the two schools. The coaches were concerned that a student on probation possibly would not return because it would be eighteen weeks before the GPA would be calculated again. Some students would not return after that length of time. In addition they raised concerns about the district not increasing the sports budgets in fifteen years, having almost less than half the coaching staffs of other districts in the conference, and having insufficient facilities. These issues addressed the question of whether there would be a full commitment to the students that now have to meet higher standards since sports needs have not been addressed. Another issue that had not been addressed in any of the earlier meetings was the definition of co-curricular. Did it include dances and homecoming activities? Will identification and GPAs have to be checked at these activities also? The board's reaction was that Dr. Hayes would have to look at the problems and resolve them. If changes need to be made, he would let the board know. The board offered the opportunity to staff and parents to be heard, to present their ideas and recommendations, and made a decision that they felt was right for the purpose of the district -- educating students. The new policy made the

board's position clear. Education was to come first and then recreation.

REFORM LEGISLATION

On 18 July 1985, legislation was signed into law that represented a comprehensive school reform package. The major components of the legislation that had direct impact on the school districts, their curriculum and instructional programs, and their finances were as follows:

1. The funding of a reading improvement program for grades kindergarten through six. Monies could be expended for reading specialists, teachers aides, and other personnel to improve reading and study skills as well as for books and printed material. The funding was based on average daily attendance and the percentage of economically disadvantaged students. It was to be phased out by June 1989.
2. An Administrator's Academy was established with goals to develop skills in staff development, communication skills, public school relations, and personnel evaluation.
3. It mandated that districts conduct staff development programs with specific outcome goals that are approved by the State Board of Education (SBE). Some funds would be available to assist in the program.

4. Grant money would be available to provide summer school for gifted students and those students needing remedial help in order to avoid retention.
5. Districts were mandated to set student learning objectives which either met or exceeded the state goals and set local goals for excellence in education. The goals and objectives were to be distributed to the public along with the achievement results.
6. A district schedule of assessment for grades three, six, eight and ten was established for reading, mathematics, and language arts. The SBE was to establish a month in which the tests were to be administered.
7. Each district was to develop promotion guidelines based on proficiency. If a student was a year or more below grade level, an individual remediation plan must be developed with input from the parent. The plan could include summer school, extended school day, special homework, tutors, reduced class size, retention, or modified instructional materials.
8. Each school district must provide to parents, taxpayers, the Governor, the General Assembly, and the SBE a school report card of proficiency as compared against the state and local standards. The

data could be used to set future targets. The SBE would prepare the form.

9. The school entrance age was changed from December first to September first over a three year period. District had the option of assessing readiness of a child for early admission.
10. The local board must have a discipline policy which specifies provisions for removal from the classroom and due process. There was to be a parent-teacher advisory committee to assist with the development of school board policy. Parents were to receive a copy of the policy within fifteen days after the start of the school year.
11. The board must include in the job description for principals that the principal responsibility was the improvement of instruction. The majority of the principal's time must be spent on curriculum, staff development, and clear lines of communication regarding school goals, accomplishments, practices, and policies.
12. Full day kindergarten programs were an option for districts. If a full day program were offered, parents must also have the option of a half-day program.

13. Each district must establish a transitional program of instruction if it had less than twenty children with limited proficiency in English.
14. In conjunction with the teachers or exclusive bargaining unit, the district must develop an evaluation program for teachers and submit it to the SBE. Tenured teachers were to be evaluated every two years.
15. High school students in grades eleven and twelve may be excused from physical education if they participated in an interscholastic athletic program, if they needed an academic class required for admission to an institution of higher learning, or if they needed an academic class required to graduate high school. School boards must establish a policy to excuse students on an individual basis.
16. Students may be excused from consumer education if they elected to take a proficiency test and achieved the minimum standard.
17. Courses in U.S. History must include labor history.
18. The current school aid formula was to be repealed as of 1 August 1987 in an effort to force a revision.

The goal of the reform was to improve the quality of education for students and to infuse funds to assist in the implementation of the mandates. Since 1987, cuts by Governor Thompson have impacted on districts' financial

resources. The mandates are still present, but money from the state has continued to be reduced and for some components eliminated completely.

The major impact was in the area of curriculum. The various subject areas needed to be assessed in terms of meeting state learning goals and objectives, promotion guidelines, state assessment of grades three, six, eight, and ten, and adjustments in the high school history and consumer education courses. An assessment needed to be made in the number of students with limited English proficiency and the possible program development for them. The option of all day kindergarten was attractive to many parents so funds needed to be allocated to conduct a feasibility study or to implement the program. Districts had to plan financially for possible changes in staffing, cost of preparing and distributing the school report card, the change in school entrance dates, the possibility of all day kindergarten and/or a transitional program of instruction, and the change in the state aid formula.

CURRICULUM

Since the framework for improvement of student achievement was in operation at the district level with excellent results, the thrust of the 1980s was to continue the growth through refinement of effective research-based teaching techniques and methodologies, the adoption of a

teaching model, standardizing the grading system, and the on-going curriculum development cycle. Additional activities coordinated by this department were the operation of the staff development program, writing of proposals for grants, state mandated reports for gifted, chapter programs, transitional programs of instruction.

One of the first projects after the instructional and curriculum programs were operating smoothly was to support the system by revising the grading system and the retention policy. Up until 1980 teachers set their own grading standards and formats. This practice caused confusion as to the meaning of grades as well as the loss of any significance to the mastery of curriculum. The curriculum directors coordinated the work of principals, team leaders, and staff to develop the guidelines. The end result was basing grades on a percentage basis (gathered from assignments, tests, homework, and other learning activities), identifying the student as at, above, or below grade level, and including a section to evaluate work habits. The information on the report card indicated the level of proficiency in the curriculum.

The promotion/retention policy was developed and adopted in 1981 with an accompanying job aid for principals which specified the procedures to be followed. The procedures required contacts with parents to inform them that performance was less than satisfactory, goal setting by

1 February, reevaluation in April, and a final decision in May. The final decision rested with the building principal. An appeal procedure was established for parents who opposed the retention decision. An additional feature which supported the standards of expectation was the ability to retain a transfer student upon entry if assessment indicated the need to do so.

Through conversations with principals, an alternative regular education program for grades one through twelve was established in 1985 for low ability students who were significantly below grade level. Placement required retention and a full case study evaluation to rule out eligibility for Special Education except for speech/language and/or social work. Student's intelligence quotient was to be between seventy and eighty. The pacing of the curriculum was modified to a slower rate yet expected a 75 to 80 percent mastery level. The main emphasis of instruction was reading, language arts, and mathematics. The program provided a regular education alternative for students who previously tested and placed in learning disability programs.

The expansion of staff development and training into a teacher-driven program came into existence in 1985. Building staff development coordinators and principals were trained in adult learning and staff development by consultants from the National Staff Development Council.

The building staff development coordinators served on the district committee as well and assisted in planning the district level staff development activities. Financial commitment was evident at both the district and building level.

In the same year the district, under the direction of the curriculum department, made a commitment to a teaching and instructional supervision model by paying the costs of training team leaders and principals with Madeline Hunter's model. These people were then responsible for training teachers and assisting in implementing the techniques in the classroom. The instructional supervision model closely resembled clinical supervision but included research-based teaching techniques for classroom teachers as well. Many teachers paid for the training on their own and were an in-house support team as well.

In 1985 grant money for school improvement and effectiveness became available. Participation in the grant was voluntary since some schools were still implementing and developing the Madeline Hunter techniques. The principal, team leader, and building representatives from those schools who chose to participate attended a three-day workshop with Larry Lezotte. They then proceeded to develop a school improvement team and work on a building improvement plan. Critical activities were establishing a mission statement, setting goals for the school, and planning activities to

bring it about. This procedure became an expected practice for all schools after the passage of the Reform Legislation. It took teaching and instructional effectiveness one step further in that it included student achievement. School effectiveness projects set student learning goals and the disaggregation of learning results by sex, background, race, and any other category the school chose as the measuring tool with which to judge the effectiveness of the techniques and methodologies. The philosophical base was that schools either improve or decline, but they don't remain the same. By involving teachers on the school improvement teams, there was a greater ownership in reaching the goals since the teachers help set them.

A major curriculum development project in reading began in 1985. The reading series currently in use had a copyright of 1976 with some lower level books having a later copyright. Since reading was such a critical component in education, intensive preliminary inservice was conducted. The first year saw the selection of a district reading committee comprised of one teacher from each building. Staff from the Center for the Study of Reading were used to inservice the committee on current findings in research, effective instructional techniques, and what to look for in selecting a text. Conversations were held also as to what to look for in the upcoming state reading assessment test.

They also visited the schools to conduct an assessment of the current status of instruction.

The next step was textbook selection. The first phase selected potential series that were K-8 and had a copyright after 1985. Then the grades two through eight district reading committee members evaluated the series using the criteria from the Center for the Study of Reading. The top five series were selected and subsequently evaluated by sixteen teachers grades K-8. The top two programs were presented by the publisher and evaluated by all K-8 teachers.

At grades seven through twelve, evaluation of reading/literature materials for remedial and regular students was conducted. Again a committee of high school and middle school teachers evaluated the books using criteria from the Center for the Study of Reading to select the top four. All teachers had input in the final selection.

Instructional strategies inservice throughout this process was critical since there were significant changes in the techniques for teaching reading. By stressing inservice during the first phase, teachers had an opportunity to try them and gain familiarity prior to the implementation phase. The transition was then easier than trying to learn everything at once.

In 1984 the curriculum department with the assistance of teachers presented its first academic spotlight to the board. There were on-going quarterly reports about the progress of the various projects, but a more indepth awareness was needed to keep the board informed about the direction and trends of the district's curriculum. These became monthly presentations which equated to about one-third of the school board's time being spent on curriculum and instruction. Some of the topics have been math problem solving, computer education, Madeline Hunter training, text book adoption, subject areas, low ability program explanation, student writing assessment and development, and career and college guidance.

MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

In November 1982 Superintendent Rutter submitted his retirement request which would be effective 10 June 1983. He would be available as a consultant until January 1984. This was one year prior to the expiration of his contract. The resignation date was four months before the school board election which had five seats open. The timing caused varying opinions from board members as to the advisability of hiring a new superintendent before an election with this many seats open. Some believed that it would give the new superintendent time to become familiar with the district's operations in order to provide stability and direction to

the new board. Others wanted Superintendent Rutter to wait a year so that the new board could hire a replacement.

The board approved a superintendent search plan as proposed by the search committee and Superintendent Rutter. The time frame had a two month posting period, a twenty day screening of applicants, three weeks to interview the final ten candidates as well as for the board to interview the final candidates, four days for possible visitations, and final approval of the new superintendent by 11 April 1984. It was agreed that the vacancy would be posted with university placement offices, the Illinois School Board Association, the Illinois Association of School Administrators, the National School Board Association, and the American Association of School Administrators. Dr. Harry Hayes was approved as the new superintendent to begin 1 July 1983.

In June 1984 Dr. Pankake submitted his request for early retirement effective 2 July 1984. He would remain as a consultant until 30 June 1985. After he left, the district posted the position but never filled it. The position was terminated and removed from the table of organization. The building principals reported directly to the superintendent as they had prior to 1974.

Interestingly the administrative organizational pattern had come full circle in fourteen years. It had started with the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction being a line

position, but building principals reported directly to the superintendent. The building administration pattern was principal and assistant principal. In the development and administration phases of the improvement of the instructional program, the principals reported to the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction who had full line authority for supervision and evaluation. The building administration pattern was principal, administrative aide, and team leader (still part of the teacher's union, not administration). Finally, when excellence was achieved, the board approved the return to the former pattern with one modification. There was a principal and associate principal (same job as assistant, but at a cheaper salary with this title). There also had been a 33 percent turnover in principals since 1986. The majority of the new principals were from outside the district and have not received the intensive training and orientation to the mission and the vision that enabled the district to achieve its goals. One question remains to be answered -- will achievement return full circle as well without the intensive support system for the teachers and students? Only time will tell the story's end.

This chapter has provided insight into the events that impacted on the financial condition of the district and the next step in the improvement of instruction -- building level instructional supervision and teacher development

known as instructional alignment. Continued improvement of curriculum through the curriculum cycle, the development of support systems for the high expectations for student achievement through a standardized grading system and a firm retention/promotion policy, the adoption of a teaching model, the refinement of effective school practices through school effectiveness training and school improvement teams, and the dedication of principals and teachers have contributed to the attainment of the goal -- getting students to learn more. Excellence has been actualized by formal recognition from the U.S. Department of Education. The dream has come true, but now it must be maintained. Whether this can be done with the continual financial cutbacks in the instructional area remains to be seen. It is a true test of how far dedication and commitment to an ideal can go.

Chapter Five summarizes the major elements that have contributed to the improvement of student learning in Valley View, relates them to some of the excellence in education literature, and describes the successful application of the elements to achieve excellence. The author also proposes topics for consideration to the board and the superintendent in order to continue to achieve excellence in student learning. With the instructional framework operating effectively, the focus must be on motivation and professional recognition of staff. The success now lies at

the base of the table of organization with the classroom teachers. All of the other components of an effective program may be in place and operating, but the classroom teacher has to believe that students can learn more and want to make it happen. This must be an on-going area of attention and emphasis.

CHAPTER V

THE CHALLENGE

1988 AND BEYOND

The beginning, the development, and the achievement of improving student learning and achievement has been accomplished. To reach this goal has required dedication to the vision in 1974 that students could learn more, the mission beginning in 1975 that student learning was the priority job, and the provision of resources to the right places to get the maximum results for the money spent. Through the leadership of Dr. Pankake, the mission for excellence was set with the adoption of six conditions necessary to improve student learning. The course was charted through the turbulence of rapid growth in enrollment, financial instability, high mobility, and disbelief that the vision could be achieved.

As James Lewis Jr. pointed out in his book Achieving Excellence in Our Schools, "it takes guts to achieve excellence in our schools."¹ The board must monitor and sometimes confront the actions of other board members, take

¹James Lewis Jr, Achieving Excellence In Our Schools (New York: Wilkerson Publishing Company, 1986), xvii.

verbal abuse from the community, have the determination to demand that administration join them in the quest, and have the endurance to put in the necessary hours to get the job done.

The superintendent has to openly examine current operations, compare them to effective business and industry operations, develop a pool of well-trained administrators from which to select a future superintendent, be people oriented, be honest about talents of administrators, and be a strategic planner who is proactive.

Principals must share power and decision-making with staff, organize them in teams to help manage the instructional program, meet with teachers and staff on a daily basis, and become a protector or support person for teachers.

Teachers must trust principals, learn new knowledge and skills, develop skills to honestly evaluate peers, and commit themselves to more than the contract requires.

A necessary element in the improvement process was the distinction between the job of the board and the job of the professionals. Dr. Brickell and Regina H. Paul's book titled Time for Curriculum clearly established these areas. As Dr. Brickell points out "professionals are experts in MEANS, not ENDS. The board is expert in ENDS."²

²Henry M. Brickell and Regina H. Paul, Time For Curriculum (Chicago: Teach 'em, 1988), 32.

This chapter focuses on summarizing and analyzing major areas addressed in the previous chapters -- enrollment and housing, management and organization, curriculum, policy, finance, and student achievement in an effort to identify whether a model exists that can be replicated or if the results were simply because of the strong leadership demonstrated by Dr. Pankake. In addition recommendations to the district are made based on Lewis' lessons from business and industry. Hard work, sweat, and dedication have been necessary to reach the current plateau. The hardest task faces the district now -- managing the high levels of achievement and still striving for more in those areas which still need improvement.

During the early 1970s there were few clear directions regarding standards for student learning, guidelines were broad and general, student achievement was poor, the board was reacting to situations and events beyond their control, and community reactions were ones of concern, anger, and a demand for something to change. In 1974 when the board committed itself to being proactive, adopted the vision of improving student learning, and changed the direction of student achievement, it took the first step towards one of the most remarkable accomplishments that a district can experience.

The areas discussed in chapters two, three, and four can be categorized into those areas over which the board had

direct control and those areas over which the board had little or no control. Finance and enrollment are the two areas over which boards have little direct control or power.

ENROLLMENT

The enrollment determined how many staff had to be hired, how many schools were to be built, what kinds of special programs were necessary, what the transportation needs were, and what the tax rates were to be in order to provide the programs and services. Homes were built, families moved in, children were served by the school district with whatever resources are available. Initially since both Bolingbrook and Romeoville were new, rapidly growing communities, developers did not contribute to the education of the children. With the assistance of the village governments, home developers now must provide the school district with funds to help offset the cost of serving the children or donate land for future school sites. With the delay in receiving taxes on new homes, the school district had to become proactive in asserting their needs and work to come to an agreement with the builders. A close working relationship with the village governments in planning the community and establishing agreements for developer contributions was critical if any proactive planning was to take place. In 1973 the board made strides in this direction when meeting with the villages to discuss

village and district boundaries, pre-annexation agreements, school sites, and developers contributions. In addition in 1975 when the board abolished standing committees and created liaison representatives, they had a voice in the major organizations and governmental groups. They could keep a pulse of what was happening and being planned, offer ideas and input from the school district's perspective, and give feedback to both groups. The key in this area was becoming proactive and planning for the trends that were developing.

FINANCE

The financial planning for the district was the most tenuous task of all. The state has set ceilings for the various tax rates. There was flexibility within the rate, but sometimes it was not enough. Valley View experienced this situation in the early 1970s when the bonding power for construction of buildings was expended. For unit districts 13.8 percent of the assessed valuation was the state limit for the sale of construction bonds. As a result the 45/15 Plan was developed and implemented as well as the use of the Capital Development Board funds for new buildings.

Assessed valuations fluctuated. Timely tax distributions initially could not be relied upon. Real estate tax money was received a year after it was due. The foundation level for the state aid formula was not announced

until after the budget was developed. Therefore estimates and guesses were made to develop the next year's budget with limitations on adjustments after the actual figures were released.

Finances and the provision of services by High School District 205 were the major reasons that Bolingbrook and Romeoville citizens pursued the split and formation of High School District 211. Referendums had been defeated, programs were being cut, and teacher positions cut even though the enrollment was increasing. By forming the new district, Bolingbrook and Romeoville residents could have a school district that would meet their needs. Since it was financially advantageous to be a unit district, the community worked together to unite. Unfortunately the area grew faster in residential than commercial development, so there were more children than the taxes could support. The 45/15 Plan provided enough space to meet the immediate need without new construction. This enabled the district to plan and build schools to keep pace with the enrollment. When the enrollment had declined sufficiently to house students on a nine-month program, the board voted to terminate 45/15.

The 1980s have seen bright, hopeful times with the winning of the suit regarding timely distribution of tax dollars from the County Treasurer and the increase in commercial growth. The dark times have prevailed, however, with the repayment of taxes on utility pollution control

devices, and the loss and subsequent repayment of taxes of utility assessed valuation. The continued reduction of funding by the state over the past decade has Illinois ranking forty-fourth among the states as reported by the 29 January 1989 issue of the Chicago Tribune. Previously it was the seventh according to a recent study by the Center for the Study of Educational Finance. The Illinois State Board of Education stated that the average district receives only 33 percent of its funding from the state and the local sources provide 61 percent. Districts are now considering filing a lawsuit to challenge the state aid formula. Past history in other states has shown that this approach many times results in an increase in funding for education whether or not the suit was won or lost. Enough pressure was generated so that something was usually done by the legislature.

In the area of finance, an appropriate goal for boards to have was to keep about 30 to 50 percent of the expenditure budget in fund balances. This would enable the district to cope with unexpected changes, to invest funds to offset fluctuations in assessed valuations, state funding, and enrollment. To date this has not been possible for Valley View. The district has had to maximize every dollar through investment planning as well as critically evaluating expenditures in an effort to balance the budget.

The one major accomplishment in this area has been the favorable outcome of the lawsuit regarding the distribution of tax money on a timely basis. This reduced the frequency with which tax anticipation warrants had to be issued and saved both the district and the taxpayers money. The working cash fund has also saved the district money by reducing the need for tax anticipation warrants. In addition the use of centralized control of instructional funds enabled resources to be allocated for maximum results as evidenced by student achievement results.

The district has direct control over curriculum, policies, management and organization, and achievement. These are the areas that Dr. Pankake focused on to bring about the improvement of student achievement. Each area will be addressed separately and then analyzed together to identify the process by which excellence was achieved.

CURRICULUM

Curriculum development can best be described in terms of Dr. Brickell's curriculum clock. Valley View began the curriculum clock with the adoption and implementation of the curriculum cycle in 1974. As each area went through the process, the components that Dr. Brickell emphasized were addressed.

Valley View's curriculum work was given structure by the adoption of the curriculum development cycle in 1974.

The assessment, development, implementation steps helped to insure that all aspects of the revision would be addressed. Curriculum guides were prepared in a format that teachers could use on a daily, weekly, quarterly basis. Resources and sample test items were included to reduce planning time. Finally a pacing schedule and instructional sequence was developed to insure that objectives would get taught. Some curricular areas had objective tests as well as quarterly or semester tests. Goals and reteaching schedules were developed based on the results of the tests. The national test at the end of the year served as an independent audit or measure of how much the students had learned.

Dr. Brickell believed that the amount of time scheduled for teaching and studying was the most powerful in determining the quantity of learning. David Berliner conducted a lot of research in the area of time utilization and the impact on learning. Key factors to assess are allocated time, engaged time, transitions, and wait time after questioning students. The higher the engaged time as compared to allocated time helped predict the success rate. Berliner also believed this to be a quality indicator.

The district included the many aspects of program in the three stages of the curriculum cycle. The current text materials and supplemental resources were assessed to see whether they were still appropriate and effective, the pacing schedule was assessed in terms of being realistic and

feasible, tests were reviewed for accuracy and effectiveness, and current research for the subject area was reviewed and the findings compared to the program. If significant differences were found, then indepth conversations about what changes needed to be brought about were held and decisions made accordingly.

In major curriculum revisions the research findings of current effective practices for the subject become important considerations in planning inservice for the improvement of teaching. Sometimes there was little change, and other times a major shift in approach and technique was necessary. This was a major consideration in planning a budget for the curriculum work. A good example was the recent revision of the reading curriculum. The current reading research reflected a major change in how to teach reading to students and which type of skills were necessary to improve comprehension. Outside experts, building reading representatives, in-school reading teams, and courses were used to retrain the teachers. This current research also was evident in the textbooks being reviewed. So a comprehensive plan of transition was developed and then implemented over a two year period.

In developing the evaluation component of the curriculum the district planned for local and national tests. The local tests indicated the level of mastery and competence on the objectives set at twelve o'clock. Through

periodic evaluation throughout the year, problem areas in curriculum and teaching were addressed immediately. Otherwise, problems possibly weren't identified until the end of the year when it was too late to reteach and prevent students from practicing mistakes. Learning was easier than unlearning and relearning.

National tests provided an opportunity to see how the students match up to the rest of the nation on the most common and basic things taught in schools. The curriculum must be broader than a national test to provide a comprehensive education. Periodically the national test must be evaluated to see if it still matches the curriculum with all of the updates and revisions. Valley View did this in 1982.

As Valley View did in 1975, ability must be measured before the standards are set. As occurred in Valley View, ability will sometimes follow achievement resulting in meeting the self-fulfilling prophecy of "students realizing their full potential." Look at the ability test and the achievement test to see what each measures. Many times the two tests by the same company will look alike. Valley View utilized an individual intelligence test on a random sample to verify the group test. The results came as a surprise to some that they indicated that students could learn more. With the rest of the curriculum clock in operation, ability can again follow achievement only in a different direction -

- up. It happened over and over again in Valley View. Thoughtfully planned standards that are high but reasonable can result in a circular effect. Teachers, students, and administrators work harder to reach the goals and actually exceed them. What a great feeling! New targets are then set based on the results and the process begins again.

MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

When Dr. Pankake came to the district, the organization was loosely coupled with curriculum, building instructional practices and procedures, and communication up and down the system. Each entity operated somewhat independent of the other which resulted in less than satisfactory student learning. The organization features that he implemented in the district included the curriculum cycle, procedures for curriculum development, building leadership organization, project management, management by objectives, centralized control over expenditures, accountability for results to a line administrator, and the establishment of the priority job definition. The curriculum cycle, project management, and procedures for curriculum development have been addressed previously. This chapter focuses on building leadership organization, management by objectives, centralized control over expenditures, accountability, and the establishment of the priority job definition.

The building level organization was changed from principal and assistant principal to principal, administrative aide, and team leader. The purpose of the shift was to utilize certified staff for the priority job of getting students to learn more. The original structure had certified staff handling non-instructional matters such as lunchroom supervision, building maintenance and after hours usage, transportation, budget, accounting and records, and purchasing. The new structure had the non-certified administrative aide attending to these areas.

The team leader was a master teacher who demonstrated knowledge and skills in teaching and who demonstrated leadership potential. The principal and team leader were directly responsible for setting the direction and goals for student learning, providing the day to day instructional supervision, and determining inservice and training needs. The team leaders were also directly involved in the curriculum development work. They served on the committees, presented the drafts to the staff and gathered feedback, and conducted inservice. The principals had periodic feedback on the materials through monthly meetings and the written forms. The team leaders kept records of student performance on an individual, class, and grade level basis. They also kept the master file of district tests and signed them out to the teachers as needed. There were monthly curriculum meetings to discuss topics of interest to the staff and to

identify any needs that they may have. Team leaders also visited classrooms to observe, model teach, assist with diagnosing problems, and help implement new techniques. They also tested and placed all new students. In management terms, the team leader was the on-line supervisor and technical expert.

The role of the principal was to observe classrooms, assist teachers in problem solving, monitor the achievement of the students, provide leadership and direction in reaching higher levels of student learning, evaluation of staff, coordinate communications between home and school, supervise Special Education testing and programs housed in the school, analyze strengths and weaknesses in the programs and improve them, and serve as the manager of the school's instructional program.

The decision in 1987-88 to change back to the original organizational pattern was a financial one. By implementing the associate principal position in place of the administrative aide and team leader positions, less would be spent on salaries. In addition the salary for an associate principal was less than that of an assistant principal. So two jobs (administrative aide and team leader) are being performed at a lower cost by one person. Now there are two certified people serving the instructional and non-instructional needs of the school. Time and the study of student achievement results will tell whether the reduction

of direct supervision and assistance time will impact on student learning.

The underlying structure of instructional management was management by objectives. Goals and objectives for student learning based on results of previous learning were implemented in all curriculum areas. This included goals set for improvement on standardized tests as well as on in-house objectives. Since the degree of coverage on standardized tests had been determined, principals and team leaders had a good idea of how students would perform as proficiency increased on district objectives. With the ongoing supervision of instruction, improved proficiency was an expectation for teachers. The goal was to have at least 80 percent of the students scoring with 80 percent mastery. Within a few years not only the mean scores on district tests were being reported, but the spread of scores according to 92-100, 88-91, 74-82, 65-73, and below 65. This equated to the standards for the letter grades on the report card. The goal was to have all students performing at a "C" or better. The spread was an important aspect to review since it was possible for a large number of students scoring at the high end to keep the mean score up and mask those students who are scoring low. By improving the spread, the mean score will go up automatically if the other students maintain high level of performance.

Once the goals were set for the year, the principal and team leader wrote a project plan which described how the goals would be achieved. The project plan included the goal, specific objectives, the project manager and staff, the tasks, operating responsibility, and the due date. This was identical to the format used in planning curriculum development work. The building goals were in essence the curriculum plan for the teachers and students.

Each quarter a management review meeting was held with Dr. Pankake and the appropriate curriculum director to discuss student progress in reading, language, mathematics, science, social studies, and health and how it compared to the goals. The quarterly goals could be revised if necessary. At the end of the year the standardized test results were included in the discussion and new goals set based on the data.

The management review meetings were utilized with teachers as well. Each quarter the principal and team leader met with the teachers to review student performance and to set goals for the next quarter. In some cases teachers also had individual improvement goals which were discussed. These quarterly meetings enabled the principal and team leader to identify areas which were doing well, which ones needed attention, specific techniques that were found successful that could be shared with the rest of the staff, and to

identify areas in which they could be assistance to the teachers.

This procedure clearly pointed out to everyone what the priority job was to be and what they were accountable for on a quarterly basis. That which administration devoted time to got done. It indicated to staff what was important and spoke louder than what was said. The board, superintendent, administration could say that improving student learning was the expectation. To cause it to happen required that they spent time tending to it. If they didn't, then actions spoke louder than words. With the above procedure in place, there was no doubt in anyone's mind what was expected to be accomplished. With the district tests and the reading series test being monitored, it was clear to the staff that the objectives were to be taught and mastered. There were no guidelines gathering dust on the shelf.

Centralized control of expenditures was initiated in 1974 and lasted until 1984. Dr. Pankake carefully monitored the needs of students and buildings and allocated money per student for the building budget. The balance was kept under his supervision to be used where it would produce the most results. This could be in the areas of staffing, instructional materials, or inservice and training. Prior to this, the money was allocated on a per pupil basis and left to the principal's discretion.

In the area of management, Valley View had implemented the MBO premises delineated by McConkey. Building level leadership was by highly competent professionals, and indepth training was conducted over a period of three years. Although improvement in student achievement was evident within two years, the board accepted the fact that it would take several years for improvement to be widespread. The focus was on product (student learning) with attention to process (methods and materials) as a means to improve the product. Yearly evaluations helped to identify those areas needing attention and those which were operating successfully. This was the organizational foundation of management. It clearly defined roles, responsibilities, direction, expectations, and accountability to the system and the programs.

POLICY

Another criterion by which the accomplishments of the district could be measured was the list of the conditions specified by Dr. Brickell, in an article titled "Ten Policies for Raising Student Achievement." The term "conditions" was used since the practices were in use for most of his suggestions, but were not necessarily found in policy. The ten were:

1. The board will spend one third of its time discussing curricular and instructional policy and

achievement. The implementation of the monthly academic spotlight at board meetings, beginning in 1984, meets this standard.

2. Principals will set targets one year before the test was given. This was a standard part of management review process.
3. Principals will pass every test administered in the schools. This was not done, but there was direct involvement in the development, review, and implementation of these materials.
4. Classroom teachers will be given inservice in their subject fields more than in teaching techniques. The district and building staff development programs enable this to happen.
5. Parents shall be given copies of the English and mathematics skills to be taught along with instructions on how to teach the skills to their own children. This was not a district wide practice. Some teachers do follow this suggestion to increase support for what was being done in school.
6. No student learning objective will appear in two different grades. To the degree possible, taking into account human error, the curriculum review process follows this practice.
7. Student learning objectives will be assigned to specific grading periods and tested with district

tests at the end of each period. This was a standard practice for reading, English and mathematics. Science, social studies, and health pacing schedules are determined by the teachers and reported to the principals.

8. National achievement tests will be administered to every grade every year. This was the practice. Because of budgetary problems, this has been changed to selected grades.
9. Individual intelligence tests will be administered in every grade every year. The individual test was used selectively in 1976 when the baseline comparison of student potential was being determined. This has not been done since. Grades one, three, five, eight, and eleven were administered group ability tests each year. With the budget reductions, only selected grades were tested annually.
10. Intellectual development will be the primary responsibility of the schools and character development the responsibility of the community. This was the practice in Valley View. In the 1970s a big part of education was helping students develop and understand their feelings, values, personality, and relationships with others. The focus changed in 1974 when the emphasis became learning. The results

since that time reflect significant improvement in learning. Along with success comes the positive aspects of self-concept and character development.

Over the past fourteen years the board adopted the policies that they believed were necessary to reach the goals of improving education for boys and girls. They included philosophy of education and instruction, finance, discipline, equivalence in instructional materials throughout the district, and co-curricular GPA. Although the ten conditions mentioned above are not necessarily in policy form, most of them have been utilized in the process and for the most part are in essence policies simply by past practice.

ANALYSIS

The criteria for whether an application exists which can be replicated was created by using effective schools correlates as determined by Edmonds, the guidelines established for the U.S. Department of Education School Recognition Program, Brickell and Paul's curriculum clock, and the components of Management By Objectives.

The MBO components were evident throughout all levels of the organization from the Board of Education to teachers. At the district level it brought focus, efficiency, and effectiveness through project management in curriculum development, focus and direction of improving student

achievement through goal setting and policy development of the board. At the building level outcome based goal setting and quarterly management review brought attention to looking at results first. Then process aspects were addressed as a means to improve the product.

Brickell and Paul's curriculum clock provided a format to assess the steps taken. The board established the twelve o'clock goals of improving student learning. Through MBO the curriculum department began the three o'clock work of planning the objectives to achieve the goals. Project management provided a framework which clearly defined roles, operating responsibility, times lines, and involvement of staff in the process.

At six o'clock the building administration and staff worked cooperatively in utilizing and monitoring the techniques and materials used to meet the objectives. The "actual means" involved aligning the instructional techniques with the curriculum to reach maximum results in student learning. The management organization of principal, team leader, and administrative aide provided the personnel whose priority job was instructional supervision.

The nine o'clock and ten-thirty aspects of evaluation and setting standards were the final components. Through evaluation of results, program and teacher delivery system effectiveness was determined. Improvements were planned, successes acknowledged, and the process continued.

The effective school correlates of Edmonds were evident at the building level. Each building developed its own mission statement which was then communicated throughout the school community. Teachers assisted in creating the school-wide improvement plans. The instructional leadership, high expectations, and program evaluation based on achievement were all incorporated in the MBO structure. The staff and administration worked closely to ensure a safe, orderly environment.

With these correlates being used in the buildings, the student achievement improvements beginning to emerge, and the improvements seen in effectiveness and efficiency as a result of MBO, significant improvement in the attitude of parents towards the school and the district as a whole became evident. Parents were now proud and supportive.

As mentioned in chapter four, the U.S. Department of Education School Recognition program established achievement as the major criteria for excellence. Additional guidelines were a strong curriculum foundation in reading, writing, and mathematics, character development, exposure to all areas of the humanities, strong leadership, community support, dedication to excellence, and the development of teacher professionalism. All of these were present due to the implementation of the effective school correlates and MBO.

CONCLUSIONS

The district's curriculum, policies, programs, and practices, and administrative leadership meet the qualifying criteria of the U.S. Department of Education and the schools meet them in atmosphere, professionalism, and commitment. In addition the main criterion for achievement has been met repeatedly over the past fourteen years. The effective school correlates and MBO have enabled the district to efficiently and effectively improve the means by which teachers could improve student learning. Brickell and Paul's curriculum clock provided a sequence of events for improvement which was followed by the district. The six conditions that the board adopted in 1974 were met with exceptional results.

The final analysis indicated that Dr. Pankake's six conditions and the above criteria can be applied in other schools with a strong potential for improving student learning.

In answering the question of whether the continuing success due solely to the strength and beliefs of one man, Dr. Pankake, the answer must be "no." There was no doubt that his strength and leadership were the driving forces in bringing about the change. But even though he has retired from the district, the program and philosophy continues to be part of the culture of the district and a standard mode of operation. It will remain as part of the culture's

operation until a decision by the board or superintendent is made to alter it. Some changes have been made in management organization, budget control, and the independent audit of student achievement. However, the strong curriculum structure, policies, belief and commitment in students learning more, and the priority job of the principal are still intact. The structure has changed, and only time will tell what the long term impact on the culture will be as a result of the recent changes.

TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION

In the author's opinion, the key to enduring success is the self-renewal mentioned by DeFour and Eaker and Lewis' concept of the adoption of the philosophy into the culture. The process must be taken one step further now, and James Lewis Jr. has some excellent suggestions from his research on business and industry.

To identify champions, Lewis suggested that principals identify outstanding teachers, then have teachers identify outstanding teachers, compare the two lists and make a list of those who appeared on both. Then interview those teachers to identify any with high risk-oriented hobbies. They will be the champions or potential champions. Interview these teachers to determine needs, develop a plan to utilize their talents, and follow up on the progress.

Include opportunities for personnel to provide suggestions and input for the improvement of the system, work to transform the philosophy into the culture through actions, conduct meetings at least quarterly and annually to review progress and set goals, make decisions by consensus, keep close to the students by involving them and being available, continue training, hire superintendents that are generalists, develop teacher and administrative career paths, recognize and reward excellence, and utilize a team approach to problem solving.

What does all of this mean to Valley View? Over the past fourteen years the district has grown and developed into an efficient, effective educational institution through the dedication and commitment of teachers, principals, administrators, and the board to a central vision of expecting students to learn more. Of the lessons mentioned above, the transfer of philosophy to culture, quarterly meetings (administrative only), and staff development and training have been implemented. Some thought needs to be given to recognizing and developing champions and utilizing their talents, recognition and rewarding excellence beyond the student and staff recognition part of the board meetings, team approach (including staff) to problem solving, meetings with staff and the superintendent quarterly or at least annually to discuss goals and the progress in meeting them, decisions by consensus, and the

development of career paths. The essence of Lewis' recommendations was broadening the involvement of the people being impacted by the problems being faced by the district, encouraging and motivating the staff and administrators to continue the mission, and developing a collaborative working relationship throughout all levels of the organization.

To keep the district moving forward in a proactive manner, the focus must be on renewal of people, the vision, and the mission with whatever resources are available. The board may wish to explore and discuss the following areas:

1. Recognize and support staff champions. Are programs in place to motivate and encourage success and excellence? Should career paths be developed to provide additional incentive for excellence? Does excellence happen in spite of district involvement or direction or because of it?
2. Orientation of new staff. What does the district do to indoctrinate and orient new staff (administration, teachers, and non-certified staff) to the vision, the mission, the history of how it happened, and their role in continuing the process? How does the district help newcomers develop ownership for the mission and vision?
3. Standards of performance. Evaluate the district's policies in terms of standards of performance. Should a minimum standard be established in terms of

the level of mastery expected for the curriculum? For example, 80 percent of the grade level will master 80 percent of the objectives. Should there be a policy specifying the standards for middle or high school graduation?

4. Student achievement. An independent audit has not been done since 1984. Perhaps an outside assessment and opinion would be appropriate. It is difficult at times to be objective about the status of the district's student achievement when one is so close to it. An independent audit will either confirm or negate beliefs about the state of the art of instruction in Valley View and offer suggestions for future goals.
 - a. Closely review student achievement patterns since 1985. At grades five, eight and eleven the performance has plateaued and in some cases declined. Why? Where is the problem? What is being done about it?
 - b. Does student achievement match potential? With the inconsistency in ability testing over the past few years, perhaps a complete update on ability and achievement through an independent audit is warranted.
5. Curriculum. Brickell recommends selection of objectives first and then the materials. Is this

practice being followed? Also are the objectives checked to make sure that they are not repeated verbatim from grade level to grade level? Is the district determining the depth of the curriculum rather than the text books?

6. Finance. Enrollment is declining, there is an increase in teaching staff, there is more money behind each child (in terms of assessed valuation), and yet student achievement is remaining stable and in some cases declining. More is being spent on instruction with less results. Why?
 - a. Finances have been an ongoing concern for the district. The severity of the lack of resources was evident in 1983 and is no different now. Why was such a financial commitment made to staff development if money was scarce? Why did the district begin paying teachers for after hours work on curriculum and training? Why the increase in the number of administrative aides at the administration center and other clerical help throughout the district? Why the increase in teaching staff? Why the increase in art, music, physical education, and ROTC teachers? There has been a 3 percent decrease in enrollment since 1985. Yet clerical has increased 22 percent; art, music, physical

education, and ROTC by 14 percent; Special Education aides by 17 percent; and custodial and maintenance by 18 percent. Teachers and Special Education teachers have increased 2 and 3 percent respectively. Why? Perhaps the board would want to assess the areas of clerical; central office administrative aides; art, music, physical education, and ROTC; Special Education aides; and custodial and maintenance.

- b. Since 1985 general expenditures have increased by 10 percent. On the revenue side, the assessed valuation has increased by 3 percent and the general revenues by 9 percent. Each year since 1985 district expenditures per pupil enrolled has gone up significantly while revenues has remained stable when compared with constant dollars. Is there some means by which a 1 percent differential can be eliminated so that revenues and expenditures are equal? The board and superintendent need to carefully assess those cutbacks which are one time only savings as opposed to those which are ongoing year after year.
- c. Long term effect of grants. The grant money from the state, for reduced class sizes in reading, will expire this year. Since this has

partially paid for the increase in teaching staff, will the class sizes go up now that the money is no longer available? Should grants be applied for and used if the district does not have the financial ability to continue the practice or program after the grant money is gone?

In summary the district has achieved a remarkable goal of improved student achievement in spite of conditions and situations over which it has had little control. By attending to those areas which it could control, the district established a framework which enabled excellence in student achievement to be attained regardless of limited resources and a rapidly changing community. The steps have included the recognition of the need to improve, the development and implementation of curriculum alignment, management and organization, instructional supervision, instructional alignment, and policy development.

The goal must now be people oriented. The district must attend to the staff's need for renewal and motivation to continue. New staff needs to understand the history, the processes and procedures that brought about the change, the transfer of the vision and mission from philosophy to culture, and the district's expectations for the job. Current staff needs renewal, recommitment, and motivation to continue. They have accomplished the goal and may feel, "I

have done it, now what?" The desire to continue and reach a new goal must be continually refueled. Dr. Hayes worked very hard over the past four years to develop community trust and support, to calm the fears of staff due to turmoil from budget cuts, and to focus on budgetary concerns. The staff has a renewed sense of worth, but it must be supported, acknowledged, and rewarded. They are the ones who really make the goals happen. Keep the vision and the mission alive with attention to renewal, recognition, and reward of the people.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Brickell, Henry M. and Regina H. Paul. Time For Curriculum, Chicago: Teach 'em, 1988.
- Dale, Ernest. Management Theory and Practice, New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.
- Drucker, Peter F. Managing for Results, New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Iacocca, Lee. Iacocca, Toronto: Bantam Books, 1984.
- Lewis, James, Jr. Achieving Excellence in Education, New York: Wilkerson Publishing Company, 1986.
- McConkey, Dale D. How to Manage by Results, 3rd Edition, New York: American Management Associations, 1976.
- Mali, Paul. Managing by Objectives, New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1972.
- Odiorne, George S. Management By Objectives, New York: Pitman Publishing Corp., 1965.
- Peters, Thomas J. and Nancy Austin. A Passion for Excellence, The Leadership Difference, New York: Random House, 1985.
- Peters, Thomas J. and Robert H. Waterman. In Search of Excellence, New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

NEWSPAPERS and NEWSLETTERS

- Bagnato, Andrew. "State's School Learn \$1.8 Billion Divided By 997 = Hassle." Chicago Tribune, 19 April 1987.
- Banas, Casey. "U.S. Looking for Top Schools." Chicago Tribune, date unknown but approximately January 1988.

- _____. "Banquet, Undersecretary Celebrate Wood View Success." The Met, 29 September 1988.
- _____. "Board Shocks Coaches, Parents with its Final Stiffer Minimum GPA Rules." The Met, 29 September 1988.
- _____. "Critics Hit School Board on Test Results Showing Student Below Average." The Beacon, 27 August 1975.
- _____. "District 205 Plagued with Money Problems." Southwest Graphic, 19 May 1970.
- _____. "FY '80 Budget to be Presented March 26, 1979." Valley View News, Spring 1979.
- _____. "Grading System Standardized." Valley View News, November 1980.
- Lelugas, Jane. "Hitting the High Marks." The Sun, 2 November 1988.
- Lelugas, Jane. "VV Gets Good News in 'Report Card'." The Sun, 2 November 1988.
- Lelugas, Jane. "Wood View Sets the Pace for School Excellence." The Sun, 28 September 1988.
- Lelugas, Jane. "Salute to Wood View." The Sun, 21 September 1988.
- Lelugas, Jane. "Majority Rule no Simple Issue in GPA Decision." The Sun, 31 August 1988.
- Lelugas, Jane. "4 School Board Members Back New GPA Rules." The Sun, 7 September 1988.
- Lelugas, Jane. "GPA Increase Faces Opposition." The Sun, 14 September 1988.
- Lelugas, Jane. "School Board Okays Tougher GPA Rules." The Sun, 28 September 1988.
- Lelugas, Jane. "District Coaches Upset over GPA Rule Passing." The Sun, 28 September 1988.
- Martinez, A. Vito. "Achieving Accountability through School Board Leadership or Why an Effective Board of Education has a Policy Development Process." Valley View News, Fall 1976.
- _____. "New Super, New Board." The Met, November 1982.

- _____. "1985 Student Achievement Results Good News." Tidbits, 30 August 1985.
- _____. "Now We Can Do It!" The Beacon, 27 July 1971.
- Olson, Lynn. "Effective Schools." Education Week, 15 January 1986.
- Pipho, Chris. "Curriculum Alignment - the Latest Accountability Model." Education Week, 28 October 1987.
- Reardon, Patrick. "State Worst in Funding of Schools." Chicago Tribune, 29 January 1989.
- _____. "Recent Testing Shows Gains but Aptitudes Below Average." The Beacon, 13 August 1975.
- Rutter, William. "School Program Change Adopted." Valley View News, Winter 1979.
- _____. "School District Battles Loss of Revenues." Valley View News, March 1982.
- _____. "School Officials Answer Critic." The Beacon, 27 August 1975.
- _____. "'Schools of Tomorrow' in Valley View District." Newspaper unknown. Clipping in Valley View Community Unit District 365U newspaper clippings files. 1966.
- _____. "School Vote Tickles Officials." Bolingbrook Met, 5 July 1973.
- _____. "Students Score in Achievement." The Sun, 2 September 1987.
- _____. "Superintendent's Message." Valley View News, Summer 1977.
- _____. "The Split Completed." The Beacon, 25 April 1973.
- _____. "Test Data Used to Increase Student Learning." Valley View News, Fall 1978.
- _____. "Testing Results Examined; More than Scores Revealed." Valley View News, September 1980.

Vavra, Bob. "Taking an Axe to the School District's Deficit." The Sun, 2 March 1988.

MAGAZINES, JOURNALS, BULLETINS

_____. Board of Education Policy Manual. Valley View Community Unit District 365U.

Cruickshank, Donald R. "A Synopsis of Effective Schools Research: Why It Is Done, How It Is Done, What Are Its Findings, How They Are Implemented." Illinois School Research and Development, 22, No. 3 (Spring 1986).

Hanna, John R. "The Project Approach and the School District." Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, 17, No.9 (May 1974).

Illinois State Board of Education. The Reform Package. The Legislature and the Schools, Governmental Relations Legislative Bulletin, XI, No.19 (10 July 1985).

Mace-Matluck, Betty. The Effective Schools Movement: Its History and Context. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1987.

_____. 1971 Comprehensive Plan, Village of Romeoville.

_____. 1988 Comprehensive Plan Draft, Village of Romeoville.

_____. "Student Housing." Community Information Bulletin, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1979.

Thompson, Tamara. "Are Your Schools Really Effective? Research Pinpoints What Makes Schools Successful." Illinois School Board Journal, March-April 1986.

U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare. Office of Education. Planning a Year-Round School Operation (A Case Study of the Valley View School District 45/15 Plan), by William Rogge. Final Report Project No. 0-0011, Grant No. OEG-0-70-2642(508), 1971.

Wilson, Bruce L., and Thomas B. Corcoran. "Places Where Children Succeed: A Profile of Outstanding Elementary Schools." Research for Better Schools, Washington, D.C.: GPO, December 1987.

MINUTES, MEMORANDA, GUIDELINES, REPORTS, LETTERS

- _____. "Announcing the Opening for Assistant Superintendent for the Division of Instruction." Brochure, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, [1974].
- _____. "Annual Financial Reports." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1971-1978.
- Bennett, William J. "Elementary School Recognition Program, U.S. Department of Education." September 1987.
- Brickell, Henry M. "Change from 1976-1977 to 1977-1978 Corrected for Ability Differences." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, July 1978.
- _____. "CPT/STEP Comparison of District to Nation Based on % Answering Correctly." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, July 1978.
- _____. "1979-1980 Basic Skills Test Results Highest in Valley View Public Schools' History." Policy Studies in Education, Spring 1980.
- _____. "Student Ability and Achievement." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, July 1978.
- _____. "Student Achievement and Adult Teaching Behaviors 1975-1976." September 1976.
- _____. "Test Scores Go Up Again." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, Spring 1979.
- Brickell, Henry M. and Regina Paul to William Rutter, David Pankake, John Eckman, Annette Moore. "Valley View Testing Program for 1981-1982 -- and Beyond." Memorandum, 27 August 1981.
- Brickell, Henry M. to David Pankake. "Excerpts from MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT Between Valley View Public Schools and Policy Studies in Education Concerning 1975-1976 Testing Program." 1976.
- _____. "Budget Message." Board of Education Minutes, 14 April 1975.
- Edmonds, Ronald, Larry Lezotte. "Fourth Annual School Effectiveness Workshop." Notebook, February 1987.
- Hayes, Harry J. to Board of Education. "Board Workshop on Monday, December 16." 11 December 1985.

- _____. "In Pursuit of Excellence: A Report on continuing Progress in Student Achievement 1974-1984." Valley View Unit District 365U, [1984].
- _____. "Instructional, Staff Development, and In-service Goals." Instructional Program Goals, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1973.
- Lukancic, John. "Fall Enrollment Comparison by Grade and Year." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, [1980].
- _____. "Occupancy Certificates Issues." Chart, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, [1979].
- Martinez, A. Vito to the Community. Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 28 March 1980.
- _____. "Memorandum: Final Report -- High school Course Goals Project." Final Report, Curriculum Projects Completed 1975-76 School Year. 1976
- _____. "Minutes of the Regular Board of Education Meeting." Board of Education Minutes, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1971 - 1989.
- Moss, Barry L. to Kent Bosworth, County Treasurer. Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 14 May 1975.
- Page, J. Patrick. "Report of District-Wide Testing Program Fall 1970-Fall 1971." 1971 Achievement Testing Report.
- Pankake, David and John Eckman. "How One School District Sought and Achieved Outstanding Performance From Its Schools," Report to the Board of Education, 11 June 1983.
- Pankake, David to K-12 Principals. "The Attached." Memorandum, 24 August 1982.
- Pankake, David to William Rutter and Paul Swinford. "Spring '77 Test Results." Memorandum, 29 July 1977.
- _____. "Process for Curriculum Development." Instructional Program Goals, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1973.
- _____. "Resolution Objecting to the 1% Tax Collection Fee the County of Will is Proposing to Implement." Board of Education Minutes, 19 May 1975.

Rogge, William. "Annual Report 1973-1974 Academic Year Valley View District 365U." [1974].

Rogge, William. "Report on Achievement Testing (1970-1973), January 1974 Report." Valley View Community Unit District 365U.

Rogge, William. "Report: California Achievement Test - 70 Edition* 1A." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1974.

Rogge, William to All Elementary Principals, All Elementary Counselors, Other Interested Personnel, 26 November 1973. Memorandum. Valley View Community Unit District 365U.

Rogge, William to David Pankake. "Recommendations for Testing and Evaluation for Valley View District for Period 1974-1980." Draft Memorandum, 24 January 1975.

Rogge, William to James Gove, 5 December 1973. Memorandum. Valley View Community Unit District 365U.

Rutter, William. "Assessment of Middle School Plan." Information Report, Curriculum Projects, 24 April 1978.

_____. "Comments on the Decision." Board of Education Minutes, 26 November 1979.

_____. Letter to Parents. 29 August 1975.

Sanders, Ted to Harry J. Hayes. Letter, 29 December 1987.

_____. "School Report Card, Wood View Elementary School." 26 October 1987.

_____. "Staff Development and In-Service Goal #1." A160 Progress and Evaluation Report, 1973.

_____. "Standard Procedure for Writing Curriculum Goals." A160 Project Instructional Program, Valley View Community Unit District 365U, [1974].

_____. "Student Achievement Report 1983-1984." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 10 September 1984.

Swinford, Paul. "Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1984." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, 1984.

Swinford, Paul. "Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1988." Valley View Community Unit District 365U.

_____. "Valley View Public School 1986 Test Information, August 1986."

_____. "Valley View Public School 1986 Advanced Placement Testing." 25 August 1986.

Wyne, Charles. "A Resource Packet for Teachers of Multi-Tracked Classes." Valley View Community Unit District 365U, [1978].

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Patricia B. Smith has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max Bailey, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; Loyola University of Chicago.

Dr. Art Safer, Associate Dean of the School of Education; Associate Professor, Department of Education Leadership and Policy Studies; Loyola University of Chicago.

Dr. Joan Smith, Associate Dean of the Graduate School; Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; Loyola University of Chicago.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to the content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 3, 1989
Date

Max Bailey
Director's Signature